

H.R. 10935. A bill making a supplemental appropriation for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for detection and treatment of, and research on, sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NIX, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STEELE, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 10936. A bill making a supplemental appropriation for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for detection and treatment of, and research on, sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 10937. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for informal entry under regulations of certain educational articles manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.R. 10938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct the cost of commuting to work at a site where no housing is available within 10 miles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 10939. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 10940. A bill to establish a national land use policy; to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to encourage and assist the States to prepare and implement land use programs for the protection of areas of critical environmental concern and the control and direction of growth and development of more than local significance; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 10941. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of police officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 10945. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, to direct the President to stabilize rentals and carrying charges through the period ending at midnight April 30, 1972; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10946. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that the rentals and carrying charges charged for accommodations in federally assisted housing may not exceed, for the period ending at midnight April 30, 1972, the levels at which rentals have been stabilized pursuant to Executive Order 11615; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAFFERY:

H.J. Res. 890. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 891. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KARTH, Mr. QUITE, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.J. Res. 892. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in FARMFEST—U.S.A. and the World Ploughing contest in September 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Texas):

H.J. Res. 893. Joint resolution to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to authorize disaster loans with respect to certain losses arising as the result of recent natural disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 894. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 410. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect

to the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H. Con. Res. 411. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of the Peoples Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the designation of the years 1973 through 1978 as the World Environmental Quinquennium to involve all nations of the world in a global environmental research program of both national and international scope; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Res. 622. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Penal Reform; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H. Res. 623. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 10942. A bill for the relief of Thomas R. Jakmides; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 10943. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Carleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 10944. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie E. Yotz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

142. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Grand Council, Order Fraternal Americans of Virginia, relative to unrestricted immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TWENTIETH CENTURY RENAISSANCE WOMAN

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the September issue of *The Retired Officer* appears an article entitled, "Jacqueline Cochran: A Renaissance Woman for the 20th Century." Miss Cochran aptly fits the description; her interests are broad and she meets all challenges with the same energy and determination that has made her the world's outstanding woman flier. It has been my pleasure and privilege to know Miss Cochran for many years. All who know and work with her admire her enthusiasm for life, her deep religious convictions, and love for her fellowman. I

want to join her legion of friends in honoring this great lady and commend to my colleagues the reading of the inspiring article which follows:

JACQUELINE COCHRAN: A RENAISSANCE WOMAN FOR THE 20TH CENTURY

According to a definition in the *Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, a Renaissance Man is "a present-day man with many broad interests who has the opportunity to indulge himself in them so as to acquire a knowledge of each that is more than superficial." That is Jacqueline Cochran, Colonel, USAFR-Ret.

Left an orphan at a very early age, Colonel Cochran grew up with poor foster parents in the South. Although her formal schooling stopped with the third grade, she had a natural curiosity to learn combined with an insatiable reading habit and she is today a well-educated woman who sits on the board of directors of George Washington University (in Washington, D.C.) and has four honorary doctors degrees.

At the age of eight she began a 12-hour night shift in a cotton mill at 8¢ per hour.

Through a determination never again to be hungry or sleep on the floor, she became a highly paid beauty operator, a trained nurse and, in the 30's, established a cosmetics manufacturing firm that she developed into a multi-million dollar business.

Most Americans, however, will remember "Jackie" Cochran primarily as a pioneer in the field of aviation. Since she began flying in 1932, she has set many aviation records and was the first woman to break the sound barrier. During the war years she was the Army Air Corps' director of women pilots and has served her country since that time in many important capacities.

TRO recently had the rare opportunity to interview Jacqueline Cochran and bring to our readers some of the wise and sensible thoughts of a woman whose many accomplishments must surely be an inspiration to young and old alike.

EDUCATION

Colonel Cochran has definite ideas on the need for education and the type of education necessary. TRO asked: If you could remake our educational system to serve our youngsters better, what would you do? What

sorts of courses do you think would be most useful?

"I'll put it this way. We have a great give-away program. We're one of the few countries in the world where you're not only given free education, but you are compelled to go. Whether you like it or not, you have to go. We graduate people from high schools who can neither read nor write.

"We must start, in my opinion, with the children. See that they're fed and housed—and not by welfare checks. These children some way, somehow, must be taken care of. Even if we have to put up a tent in the middle of the town to feed and house them.

"Now, they also should be trained—I'm not using the word 'education.' If one is capable, he must know how to read and write, add and subtract. Do certain simple things. Simple things can do an awful lot for one. You'd be surprised how few people can read and write—sometimes at a very high level. People should be taught to read very fast—and comprehend what they read. I'm talking about the normal person—a C, not a B—just an average person. If they could do this, it would build their own ego up to where they could do all kinds of things.

"When a person finishes high school, he should know a trade and know one thing well, because none of us, in my opinion—unless we're awfully lucky—ever get to do what we want to do. We all think the other pasture is greener. One has to learn to discipline himself to do the thing he knows how to do very well indeed."

We asked about how to handle specially gifted children, those who are so easily bored by the average classroom.

"Maybe they should be put in special schools. We create special schools for idiots, we create special schools for the slow, we create special schools for everyone but the very gifted. And the very gifted—for there aren't very many of them in this world—should have a very special school where they can go and become the mental giants of this world. They're entitled to it. In my opinion, this is what education is all about. If they're specially gifted, they need very special circumstances under which to learn—all kinds of stimulation, everything in the world put at their feet."

AVIATION

One of the leading figures in the growth and development of modern aviation in this country, Colonel Cochran recalled how she got started flying.

"Some friends of mine one night said, 'Of all the things you want to do in your life, what are you going to do?' I said, 'I'm going to do all these things'—and I outlined my plans—definitely. (And I did everything I outlined.) Then they said, 'But you'd have to fly to do all that!' I responded, 'That sounds like a good idea.' (I had just read a book on How to Fly in Three Easy Lessons.) You know, it's funny—I'd never even seen an airplane on the ground in my life.

"Shortly after that I went out one Saturday morning and had my first free lesson, bought the course, soloed on Monday, went to Canada two weeks later—solo—and so a pilot was born!"

Since that time Jacqueline Cochran has established and still holds more international speed, distance and altitude records than any other person.

"I met Amelia Earhart's husband and he said, 'What do you want in aviation, little girl?' I said, 'To put your wife in the shade. Not only that—I'm going to be the first woman in the world to make Mach II'."

"At that time, nobody had ever heard of Mach I. I was lucky enough to know the great Dr. von Karman, who spent more than two years in our home. One time we were talking about speed and he said, 'Do you know what the speed of sound is?' I asked,

'No, what is it?' It's traveling 760 miles an hour at sea level at standard temperature.' I said, 'I'm going to be the first woman in the world to do it!'

"Then I asked, 'What's Mach II? I've got to do that one, too!' I did. I did both—the first human being, female, that did both Mach I and Mach II. In fact, I did 2.5 machs last go-round. This was solo—not with someone else. You go out and fly the airplane alone. You beat it almost to death and you beat yourself almost to death, too.

"But I've been a good pilot. I've done some remarkable things in flying. They're so incredible that I look back and I can't believe that I've done them. I feel like I'm a person outside of myself who's been flying these airplanes. But one can. You have to work 14 hours a day and become so disciplined that you can't believe you're that disciplined. I would never let anything interfere with what I had to do in flying—ever. It really has been my life—my passport to happiness."

Jackie Cochran and Amelia Earhart were very close, especially in the last few months before Miss Earhart's final flight. We asked about the books published recently suggesting that Amelia Earhart is alive, well and living in New Jersey.

"There is no truth that I brought her out of Japan. The New Jersey woman doesn't even look like Amelia—even an older Amelia. After all, she would have been high up in her 70's by now. The truth is, she and her navigator just plain couldn't find that island, ran out of gas and crashed in the Pacific."

As an aviator, Colonel Cochran tested many experimental aircraft. Regarding some areas of contemporary aviation, we asked: The SST—do you feel that the decision reached by Congress was a valid one or one based on emotionalism and politics?

"I think it's the most terrible thing that has ever happened to this country, aeronautically speaking. Now, I didn't like the way we went about awarding the contracts—but that's my opinion. And it's too long a story to tell.

"But nevertheless, the contract was awarded and it was practically finished—and a man by the name of Proxmire scuttled the whole thing! How could he do this to our country?"

Do you feel our space program is valuable?

"I think it's the greatest thing that's ever happened in the world. I can't think of anything we shouldn't do to promote it. People say, 'They're going to bring more rocks back?' Well maybe they should bring some soil back. Maybe we should do all kinds of things. They haven't touched the surface of what could be done."

Do you feel our defense system is adequate and if not, in what areas do you feel that we are weak?

"As far as I can determine, a great many of our people who hope—or are hopeful—that we have a good defense posture think we're way down the totem pole. That, if tomorrow morning somebody were to walk in on us—like China or Russia or the rest of these countries—we'd be in pretty bad shape. We have nothing—we have no bombers, we have nothing in space, we have nothing to defend ourselves with today. And, I think we're sitting back here on a pretty bad posture. But this is my opinion, based on my exposure and background."

BEING A CITIZEN

Flag-waving may not be fashionable today, but Jacqueline Cochran does it—and with style. She asked what our TRO reporter thought was the most horrendous crime that can be committed and then answered: "Treason is the worst crime that can happen to a nation—not only our nation, but any nation. Sabotage on a big scale, where, may-

be, a whole factory of people is destroyed."

She continued to explain her views:

"People have to be devoted to many things—first of all to their country. I only have one little yardstick to go by and that's what I was able to do for myself and what I've been able to do for my country. I think I've earned my keep as a citizen. That's another thing that I beef about—one has to earn their right to live! You can't just arrive on this earth to make it filthy and dirty."

"Maybe you'll say, with the attitudes today, that a man shouldn't be in combat. I'd like to be in combat. It's our country and we should defend it and our principles."

MARRIAGE, WOMEN AND WOMEN'S LIB

In these turbulent times, any woman who can stay married 32 years to the same man (financier Floyd B. Odum) and still be able to say, "I'm married to a fantastic, fabulous man, I mean, he's the most amazing person in the world!", TRO felt was qualified to comment on marital relationships:

"I think too many people start out—men and women—with the idea that they're going to make each other over. They're going to be different people and so on. They haven't really formulated a good concept of what marriage is supposed to be before they start."

What, do you think, is a woman's place in our society?

"Oh, women have a very important place. They rule the world! They've ruled kings. I don't know why people worry about woman's place!

"Women have the same intelligence as men, they have the same ability. But they should not forget that they're women. They should populate the world; they should have a women's place in the world or they're not going to be any good when they're 40.

"I am trying to say that we all have our place in life, but people have forgotten what their places are."

How can a wife help her husband's career?

"A wife, if her husband wants her to, can interest herself enough in his business to be a sounding board for his ideas. She can answer him or not answer him, whichever she finds out is helpful to him. She can have his home beautifully run so he can call her at a minute's notice and say, 'Sorry, dear, but I have to bring four people home for dinner.' A man who brings people into his home is proud of his home; he's proud of his wife or he wouldn't do that in the first place. She is being helpful—but not if she starts interfering or meddling.

"I've seen women who were very harmful, I thought, to their husbands' careers. In the first place, I think any woman who, at any time, meddles in her husband's affairs, goes to his office, gets involved with the people he employs or he has subordinate to him—or even 'sparks' the boss—is for the birds! I don't think a wife should ever interfere in her husband's business life or get involved with his business associates.

"Mr. Odum had multiple companies that he controlled and we built our ranch—part of it—to take care of his business life. I hired a woman to do all of that. Many times I would never come out for dinner. If I did, I'd have a drink with him and go on about my way. Naturally, I had flying to talk about which didn't bother anybody—though I didn't talk about that very much either. Now, since he's retired, I meet some of these people I did like and they say, 'Gee, I didn't know you were such a warm, friendly person.' I reply, 'I don't interfere with my husband's business.'"

Although Jacqueline Cochran scoffs at the notion of Women's Lib ("Liberation? Liberated from what?"), she nevertheless represents what probably every Woman's Libber would like to be: an independent personality, with her own identity very clearly separated.

rate from her husband and his career. In this vein, TRO asked: What do you feel about the opportunities open to a female in commercial aviation? Should she be restricted to the role of stewardess and not trained as a pilot, engineer, etc.?

"Today, to qualify a 707 pilot, the airlines spend somewhere near \$200,000 on a man. To realize their investment, he must work all of the 20-plus years left before his retirement. A woman may want to have a family during that period. Would you want to fly behind a pregnant pilot? But women certainly could be trained as engineers."

What of a woman's physical stamina—can she perform usefully as an astronaut?

"I think women definitely have more stamina than men. Childbearing alone bears that out. Women can stand more pain. Imagine carrying that extra weight around for seven months!"

What do you feel about mixed (man and woman) space crews?

"It wouldn't work in the three-man crews. I've talked to the men and they don't like the idea. It barely works with the men. They would need more space than they have now—to walk around, more privacy, etc."

Do you think an all-woman crew could function as well, do the tasks the men do, etc.?

"I think so, yes. And the reason I say so: In World War II we had a problem with the B-26 Martin built. I put women in B-26's—150 of them. They did about 70,000 operational hours with one minor accident and not a single fatality. They were always all-women crews and they worked very well. It was a very difficult aircraft because we didn't understand it (it really wasn't difficult except that people didn't understand it), and they did extremely well."

"Then I had all-women crews, during work out in Camp Davis—which was highly secretive at that time—controlling aircraft over ranges where the ground crews could shoot them down. It was so dangerous you could run into the flack yourself. We never had a fatality—we never had anything happen. It was just marvellous!"

Another question—How do you think a woman would be as President?

"Well, we've had so many bad Presidents, they'd probably do as well as any other."

"It's a silly question, in a way. It's not a man's world, entirely—it's not a woman's world either! I'm really going to emphasize this: Anyone who has qualified to do a job and does his homework, it doesn't matter what his sex is."

And summing up:

"Women are very strong people. They're very amazing. Collectively, they're probably more amazing than men. But no woman could do without a man. I wouldn't want to live in a manless world, would you?"

YOUTH AND LIFE IN THE FUTURE

With daily headlines telling of youth and its disaffection with our current situations, TRO asked Colonel Cochran for her notions on why our young people seem to be so troubled:

"It starts back at home. There is no home life—the close-knit family life, the picnics together, the praying together, the living together and the thoughtfulness together. They're hunting and seeking because they don't have this. I don't want to use the word 'security,' but maybe it is a form of security."

"Oh, you can turn around and say, 'Well, it didn't happen to you. But you see, from the time I was 11 until I was about 14, I lived in an Orthodox Jewish home. They had six sons and their home was run and properly. The family ate together every night. I watched all this; it even gave me a stabilizing influence. Probably at the time I didn't realize it, but it was good."

"Children don't have too much goodness in their lives. They see their glittering parents and too many cars. Parents buy cars for the

kids when they're 16 and they're off and running. They don't have time to be courteous."

"I don't know what's brought all this about, but there's something in the atmosphere that's not healthy, that isn't normal. Therefore, there's rudeness, neglect."

"But there is also love and tenderness and sweetness. I think we tend to focus on those who are not nice rather than on those who are nice. So I think there's still hope for us as a human race."

You have accomplished so many things in your life. How could a young person today accomplish as much as you have?

"You make your opportunities. You don't say, 'Gee, I'd like to do that.' You say, 'I'm going to do that!' I've only said I'd like to do something once in my life—and I failed. I just say I'm going to do it."

"One must know what they want. Most people wander in the dark. Why? You see, to me, marriage, children, these things are natural for people. But they don't always happen. If they don't happen, that's unfortunate—but it's not a tragedy."

"But people should not work hard unless they have a focal point. Something they want to accomplish. It doesn't matter whether it's for their country or for themselves or an organization. Then they have to work hard to do it. And they have to make up their mind to do it."

"People have to learn to curb their emotions, discipline themselves. There's a complete breakdown of discipline in this country. I cannot believe some of the things that are happening in our country. If a boy's AWOL today from the military, they sort of kiss it off. They shouldn't do that!"

She continued with another theme:

"You start school when you are six and finish when you are 20 or 21. Then you have a B.A.—a piece of paper in your hand. I don't know the percentage, but I would guess most of the people who get a straight B.A. are not prepared to make a living. They don't know how to go out and get a job and say, 'I can do this.'"

"There are an awful lot of mundane jobs that no one, but no one, has ever built up. Now, take domestics. We don't build up this kind of job. We make it look as though there is something ugly about it. Well, there isn't! It's a completely normal job for people to do."

"We are so out of balance in our country. We act as though there's a stigma! Now as a youngster I've cooked for people and I don't feel a stigma! I've had every honor in the country and I'm delighted to say I've cooked for people, I've made their beds, I've nursed and I loved it! But people are not taught these things—to say it's wonderful to earn a day's keep."

SENIOR CITIZENS

With an eye to the more specialized problems of our members, TRO asked: Do you think we are making adequate use of our older citizens who are still in good health?

"I don't think there is such a thing as a numerical age. We have to have a numerical versus a physical age and we should be judged accordingly. I think that when the gong sounds—say when 65 years old—and you are healthy and well, you've still got great talents to give to people—helpful talents—you shouldn't just be shut off. I also think, with all my heart, that until we finally determine numerical versus physical age, we're going to go on losing great gold mines of talent in our country."

"I know a man who had about two years to go with an airline. He'd raced, he was a great pilot, he'd worked on his farm and he was physically fit—he looked about 45. But at 60 years old—bingo! Now he's testing airplanes. Today he's 65 and he's still testing! Why should an airline be denied this talent?"

"I've seen people who were 45 that were very old in flying (it's the only place I've observed it). But at 45 years old they were

old men. What that is, whether it's chemistry or whatever, I don't know. But I've seen people old at 45 and I've seen people young at 60."

To try to give Jacqueline Cochran in microcosm in these few pages just is not possible. She is many people in one person—the aviatrix who took unbelievable chances and even today holds international and national records that have never been beaten; the cosmetics executive who built and ran a million-dollar business for over 25 years; the little girl from the poor South who has never lost her wonder and enthusiasm for life in spite of her success, the famous people she has known and the awards she has won—including our country's Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Flying Cross (three times) and the Legion of Merit from our own country, and the Legion of Honor from France, to mention a few; the worldly lady who is the friend of Presidents and statesmen—these are all "Jackie" Cochran. But she is more than that. She is wholly a woman for her times.

U.S. DEPENDENCE UPON RUSSIA FOR CHROME ORE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Nation's press has taken commendable interest in the question of the dependence of the United States upon Russia for most of its imports of chrome ore.

Last week the Senate, by a vote of 36 to 46, defeated an amendment which would have removed from the military procurement bill section 503. This section would permit resumption of chrome imports from the world's leading source of chrome, the African nation of Rhodesia.

On August 26, the Jefferson City, Mo., Post Tribune published an interesting editorial maintaining that it is inconsistent for this Nation to continue its boycott of Rhodesia while opening trade and other relations with Communist China.

On August 27, the Forrest City, Ark., Times Herald published an editorial supporting legislation to end the ban on imports of Rhodesian chrome.

Furthermore, on September 1, in the Birmingham Post-Herald, a letter to the editor from Mr. George W. Crocker, of Tuscaloosa, took the same position.

These expressions are in addition to dozens of others which have come to my attention in recent weeks.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these items be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.), Post-Herald, Sept. 1, 1971]

IMMORAL POLICY

The present foreign policy of the U.S. government is immoral and insane. Our government is locking arms in friendship with our enemies, while spitting in the face of our friends. It seems that a firm, anti-Communist government is the only type government which our State Department and Congress will not tolerate.

To attempt to destroy a government which is maintaining domestic tranquility and pre-

serving the liberties of its inhabitants is immoral. However, this is the policy our government is following in regard to Rhodesia. This small nation of 5 million people is one of the most prosperous countries in Africa, and its people—both black and white—enjoy liberty. Yet, we join with the Communist controlled United Nations in an effort to impose on Rhodesia, a system of government which has brought chaos and pro-Communist dictatorships to much of Africa.

Our treatment of Rhodesia is not only immoral, but it is detrimental to the interest of the United States. Senator Harry Byrd states that our country "faces an imminent and serious shortage of chrome." The shortage of this vital metal is a direct result of the boycott of Rhodesian chrome. Communist Russia is now furnishing much of our chrome ore at greatly inflated prices. To become dependent on an enemy for a critical defense material, as we are doing, is insane!

Peaceful Rhodesia is treated as an outlaw nation because she has certain voter qualifications which prohibit immediate rule by a grossly unqualified majority. Contrast the Nixon policy toward Rhodesia with his recent support of the Red Chinese regime, and you will find that the President is not an anti-Communist.

GEORGE W. CROCKER,
Tuscaloosa.

[From the Jefferson City (Mo.) Post Tribune,
Aug. 26, 1971]

NIXON'S NEW CHINA POLICY REOPENS ISSUE ON RHODESIA

President Nixon has inadvertently reopened debate on another area of United States foreign policy with his recent overtures of reconciliation with Communist China.

How, observers are asking, can the President reconcile our continued participation in the United Nations' economic boycott of the African nation of Rhodesia while opening trade and making other conciliatory steps toward Peking?

While the Nixon Administration's new stance toward Red China does not embrace the Mao Tse-tung regime ideologically, it in effect no longer regards Peking's domestic or international policies to be so offensive as to warrant continued boycott of Red Chinese products or its membership in the world body.

As a result, some members of Congress are asking, "Why, then, do we continue to boycott Rhodesian products, some of which (especially chrome) are vital to our national defense?" It's a good question, worthy of an answer from the White House.

In comparison to China Communist Party Chairman Mao, Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith stands like an angel. Moreover, Rhodesia has long been a friend of the United States. On the other hand, Red China continues to be an enemy of this nation despite its bid for concessions.

Of particular concern on Capitol Hill is the fact that as a result of the anti-Rhodesian sanctions, the U.S. is now heavily dependent upon Soviet Russia, another enemy, for chrome ore. Since the UN sanctions in 1967, the United States has been buying 60 per cent of our chrome from the U.S.S.R. at about \$75 per ton. Prior to the sanctions which were pushed by Great Britain, we were buying the same percentage from American-owned companies in Rhodesia at \$25 per ton.

Despite inflation, it is obvious the Soviet Union is taking Uncle Sam (American taxpayers) for a financial ride.

Several months ago, Sen. Harry F. Byrd (I-Va.) introduced a proposal which would end the Rhodesian boycott relative to chrome. The Byrd amendment provides that in the event the U. S. is importing a material deemed by the Office of Emergency Preparedness as a "strategic commodity" from a Communist source, there shall be no law against

importing the same material from a non-Communist source. In fact, the U.S. should end all economic concessions against Rhodesia.

One would have thought the Byrd proposal would sail through Congress. Not so! The liberal Senate Foreign Relations Committee, headed by color-blind J. William Fulbright, tabled the measure. Fortunately, the Armed Services Committee tacked the Byrd amendment to a military procurement bill scheduled to be voted on in the fall. Sen. Byrd is hopeful of Senate passage. House approval seems certain.

But the issue doesn't end there.

In view of his new policy of "normalizing" relations with Red China, President Nixon should end all economic sanctions against Rhodesia. Furthermore, we believe he owes the American people an explanation for this obvious double standard—one in which we disdain our friend and the other where we are moving to grant concessions to an enemy of freedom—Communist China.

[From the Forrest City (Ark.), Times-Herald, Aug. 27, 1971]

TODAY'S EDITORIAL: END THE BOYCOTT

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., Independent-Va., has introduced a piece of legislation which is vital to the future of the United States as a free nation.

Byrd's bill provides simply that importation of strategic materials from a Free World country cannot be prohibited so long as imports of the same commodities are permitted from a Communist country.

The purpose of this provision is to correct an almost insane situation which has been permitted to develop and which now endangers America's capacity to defend herself in case of Soviet aggression. This is the refusal of the United States to buy chrome ore, vital to defense production, from Rhodesia, and its increasing reliance upon none other than Russia for this strategic material.

The United States refuses to trade with Rhodesia because it is ruled by a minority government and allegedly is a threat to international peace. As a consequence, the U.S. now buys a major portion of its chrome ore from the Soviet Union, a country which is ruled by a brutal one-party dictatorship and constantly instigates threats to world peace.

The result is that the United States has made its defense production dependent upon the very nation we are supposed to be defending ourselves against. Dependence now is estimated at more than 50 per cent. It will go higher to the point of paralyzing American defenses unless our elected representatives stir themselves.

Byrd's legislation would have the effect of reopening trade with Rhodesia and easing the Soviet grip on America's defenses. The issue is nothing less than our survival as a free and independent nation, but official Washington today is so caught up in false hopes of peace that neither the administration nor Congress will act unless they hear from the people.

THE STATUS OF RETURNABLE CONTAINERS IN YONKERS, N.Y.

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Mayor's Environmental Committee for Action of Yonkers, N.Y., recently made a survey of the availability of nonreturnable beverage containers in their area. They also

compiled some interesting cost analyses of returnable versus nonreturnable containers.

Several Members, including myself, have introduced legislation to ban nonreturnable bottles and cans from the marketplace. We often hear manufacturers argue that consumers choose the nonreturnables over the returnables. The most startling information in the survey is that there is very little choice afforded the consumers. For example, only half the stores surveyed offered soda—and only one brand at that—in returnable containers; and only 13 percent offered in popular sizes.

I commend the study to my colleagues to aid them in their continuing analysis of environmental legislation.

The study follows:

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF RETURNABLE CONTAINERS IN YONKERS

Non-returnable beverage containers are becoming an everincreasing problem. From an environmental standpoint, disposable cans and bottles are a drain on our natural resources. Appropriate space for their disposal is becoming scarce. "Throw-away" containers are also a large part of our litter and solid waste problem. The taxpayer bears the cost of the collection and disposal of this refuse. Considering these problems, it has been generally agreed that recycling is the only long-term solution.

Based on the premise that recycling is a necessity, we wanted to determine how it could best be encouraged. Obviously, the best way to promote recycling is to have returnable bottles available with a deposit high enough to encourage their return. The first part of this report, then, will deal with the availability of returnable containers in the city of Yonkers.

In order to determine which Yonkers stores carried returnable beverage containers, those food stores listed in either the Westchester or Yonkers telephone directories were contacted by phone. Also contacted were the local A&P, Finast, and Grand Union chain stores that were not listed in the directories. Without disclosing that a survey was being taken, we inquired as to whether they carried returnable beverage containers and, if so, which brands and in what size containers. A total of 106 stores were surveyed, with the following results:

From the following table, it can be easily seen that beverages in returnable containers are not readily available in Yonkers. Only half of those stores surveyed carried any returnable bottles and even these were limited in size and brand. Just one store carried money-back bottles for soda other than Coca-Cola, and only 13% of the groceries offered Coke in returnable bottles smaller than 26 oz. Neither diet soda nor beer could be found in returnable containers.

RESULTS OF SURVEY

[In percent]

	Yes	No
(a) Stores carrying returnable containers....	50	50
(b) Chain stores carrying returnable containers.....	86	14
(c) Small stores carrying returnable containers.....	40	60
(d) Stores carrying Coke in returnable containers.....	50	50
(e) Stores carrying returnable Coke not in 26 oz. containers.....	13	37
(f) Stores carrying other soda (not Coke) in returnable containers.....	1	99
(g) Stores carrying diet soda in returnable containers.....	0	100
(h) Stores carrying beer in returnable containers.....	0	100

After determining that beverages in returnable containers are severely limited in Yonkers, methods were considered for increasing their availability. Discussions with store managers have shown that they will not voluntarily increase the selection of returnable beverage containers. An alternate solution to this problem would be to ban non-returnable containers through the legislative process. Although the environmental benefits of such a bill cannot be contested, too great a cost to the consumer would be undesirable. The second part of this study will consider the difference in prices between returnable and non-returnable beverage containers.

A random sample of 53 stores was taken from the original list for collecting the information used in this study. MECA volunteers went to each of the stores to determine the prices of the following six items (where available): six-pack (16 oz.) returnable bottles of Coke; two 26 oz. returnable bottles of Coke; eight-pack (16-oz.) no-return bottles of Coke; two 32 oz. no-return bottles of Pepsi; six-pack (12 oz.) no-return cans of Pepsi; six-pack (12 oz.) no-return cans of Coke. The average price and the average price per ounce of the six items were calculated.

	Average price	Per ounce	S.R.P. ¹	Per ounce
(a) 6-pack (16 oz.) returnable bottles ²	\$1.09	\$1.13	\$0.79	\$0.82
(b) 2 26-oz. returnable bottles ²58	1.04	.49	.94
(c) 8-pack (16 oz.) no return bottles ²	1.64	1.28	1.45	1.18
(d) 2 32-oz. no return bottles ²74	1.16	1.09	1.70
(e) 6-pack (12 oz.) no return cans ²	1.13	1.57	1.03	1.48
(f) 6-pack (12 oz.) no return cans ²	1.12	1.56	.99	1.24

¹ Suggested retail price.

² Coke.

³ Pepsi.

Contrary to expectations, the items with returnable containers cost less than those with non-returnable containers. Coca-Cola was used for price comparison because it was the only brand that stores offered in returnable containers. Pepsi was used for its similar quality and container sizes and for statistical reasons (see Appendix C). The manufacturers' S.R.P. was used for its statistical equivalence to prices found in chain stores.

	Returnable	Nonreturnable
(a) Average cost per oz. (S.R.P.).....	\$0.88	\$1.24
(b) Average cost per 12 oz. (S.R.P.).....	10.46	14.86
(c) Average cost per oz. (survey).....	1.09	1.34
(d) Average cost per 12 oz. (survey).....	13.08	16.08

¹ Suggested retail price.

The average price for twelve ounces was computed because that is the most abundant size beverage container. The possible savings for Yonkers' consumers in purchasing only returnable containers can be calculated from this information.

	Survey	S.R.P.
(a) Average savings per 12-oz. bottle (cents).....	3	4.4
(b) Average savings (percent).....	23	42
(c) Annual savings to Yonkers consumers (millions).....	\$1.6	\$2.3
(d) Annual savings family of 4.....	\$32	\$46

¹ Suggested retail price.

The actual savings are probably somewhere between the result of the survey and that of the manufacturers' suggested retail price,

which is close to the average price found in chain stores (see Appendix C). Although a \$1.6 million savings is considerable, it can be seen as a conservative amount. This is due to the much larger marketing volume of chain stores, which increases the probable consumer savings. The figures were calculated by multiplying the average savings per bottle by the 53 million beverage containers Yonkers consumers buy annually.

CONCLUSION

The Yonkers consumer does not now have a real choice between returnable and non-returnable beverage containers. Industry states that the consumer has chosen disposable bottles over returnables. The truth is that this choice has been made by the food stores and not the consumers. If you want beer, diet soda, or regular soda other than Coke, you must buy non-returnables. If you want to buy Coke in returnable bottles smaller than 26 oz., you will have to do much searching to find a store that carries them. With a little effort, you can probably find returnable Coke in 26 oz. bottles, but for a citizen unwilling to damage the environment with empty cans and bottles, this is not much of a choice.

For environmental reasons, it is very advantageous to promote recycling through the use of returnable bottles. Even if returnables did cost more, it would be worth a few cents extra in order to reduce the environmental problem, but returnable containers do not cost more money—they are cheaper. Returnable bottles are as much as 42% less expensive. This equals 4.4¢ per twelve ounce container. Yonkers' consumers could save as much as \$2.3 million annually if they used only returnables. That equals \$46 a year for a family of four.

Usually, economic arguments run contrary to environmental arguments. In this case, we can save money and help the environment at the same time. All we have to do is require that all beverage containers be returnable. This will permit us to take advantage of a rare opportunity.

A NATIONAL COMPUTERIZED ADOPTION PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, recently I announced my intention to offer an amendment to the omnibus social security and welfare reform bill to establish a computerized national adoption information exchange program.

Such a program would help to solve a nationwide problem. In some communities there are many would-be parents—but not children available for adoption. In other areas, many children are available for adoption—but there are no prospective parents interested in adopting them.

Such a nationwide information exchange program, utilizing modern computer technology, could be particularly helpful in finding homes for minority group children, those of mixed racial backgrounds, and youngsters with physical or psychological handicaps.

Recently, I received a thoughtful letter from Mr. and Mrs. Dwight McMurrin, of Ann Arbor, Mich., who have experienced serious difficulties in their efforts to adopt a child. Their experience

underscores the need for a national adoption network.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
September 19, 1971.

Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRIFFIN: I read in a Detroit paper recently about your proposal for a computerized adoption exchange. How very much in need our family is for just such a service. We began our adoption proceedings in October 1970, with the Michigan Social Service Department in Ann Arbor. Little did we dream that a year later we would still be waiting for a black or bi-racial boy, between 1½ to 3 years old.

We have made personal telephone calls to places as far away as Amarillo, Texas; St. Louis, Missouri; Chicago, Illinois; Richmond, Virginia; and as close as Toledo, Ohio. This has all been in a vain search to locate a child after getting a lead through Time Magazine, newspaper articles, or referrals. We are unwilling to give up, but dread the thought of another year's wait. Surely some agency in the U.S. has a child waiting for the love and security our family has to offer.

We can continue this desperate search throughout other States or sit back and wait until our agency turns one up. In the meantime, the child we seek lingers on another year without permanent parents. Since my husband is a Junior High School Teacher and myself a former Elementary School Teacher, we know how detrimental it can be for a child to be shuttled from foster home to foster home.

Please work hard and get Congress to approve your amendment for a computerized adoption information exchange program. We know of several other Michigan families, like ourselves, who have already waited one and two years for racially mixed children. This indicates the supply is not being matched with the demand. Our family is discouraged with waiting.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. DWIGHT McMURRIN.

QUAKER OATS CO. HIGHLIGHTS SOCIAL AWARENESS

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a highly informative article appeared recently in the Chicago Daily News—attesting to the awareness of the Quaker Oats Co. of the social problems of our society.

This example which has been set by Quaker Oats Co. is one which American industry generally should consider following.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that many of the officers and employees of the Quaker Oats Co. reside in my 12th Congressional District of Illinois, and that this Illinois-based company is providing significant leadership in behalf of a better America and a better world.

Mr. Speaker, the article, reproduced from the June 24 edition of the Chicago Daily News, follows:

SOCIAL AWARENESS PROFITS COMPANY: QUAKER OATS PROJECT TEACHES NUTRITION TO POOR
(By David Hall)

In 1966 Quaker Oats Co. was running a program where its employees spent two hours once a week, tutoring children on Chicago's South Side.

The Quaker workers noticed that many of the 8-to-12-year-old children kept falling asleep during the early evening sessions.

The reason was hunger. Many of the children hadn't eaten since breakfast.

"We found we weren't really doing much to teach nutrition," said Thomas F. Roeser, director of public affairs at Quaker.

So in that year, Quaker contracted with home economist and teacher Mrs. Velma Hines Dixon to work on the problem.

Predictably, she found that hunger and malnutrition was caused by poverty. But she also found a surprising lack of knowledge on how to plan proper meals.

Mrs. Dixon worked through community organizations and churches. She held classes, often in the apartment of one of her pupils. What she taught was basic meal planning and nutrition—with the emphasis on help for the low-income homemaker.

Her programs have included trips with students to local markets, where she held classes on shopping. She has taught some 500 persons under the program.

Quaker now has Mrs. Dixon working with the Chicago Department of Human Resources, teaching persons to carry on nutritional-education programs among poor people.

This Quaker Oats program has been little publicized in an era when corporations are grabbing for every chance to link themselves with concern for the consumer.

Little publicity also has been given to Quaker's underwriting of Sesame Street for showing on television in Chicago, Buffalo, N.Y. and Washington, D.C. The company is spending \$100,000 a year to bring this acclaimed educational show to pre-school children. And in Chicago, the Sesame Street 5-hour rerun on Saturday morning is shown opposite some commercial TV shows sponsored by Quaker Oats.

The company is active politically, too—without apologies.

"We have the basic corporate policy that when there is a public issue that involves us, we'll respond," said Robert Thurston, vice president-corporate affairs.

In the current session of Congress, Quaker is actively supporting a bill sponsored by Rep. John Erlenborn (R-Ill.). The Elmhurst lawmaker would establish a statutory office of consumer affairs in the White House and create a consumer-protection agency within the Federal Trade Commission.

The company encourages its plant managers to write or call a congressman in their district when a piece of legislation that Quaker is interested in is being considered.

Roeser says: "We have always believed we should support legislation rather than oppose it—where we can."

The company would prefer to see private industry increase its efforts to reform and police itself. But Roeser acknowledged that too often, trade associations have "become vehicles to tell an industry what bills they should oppose next."

Quaker, through one of its top officers, played a large part in an ambitious effort to bring effective self-regulation to advertising. Company vice president Victor Elting Jr. has spent most of the last year developing the program.

The plan sets up a National Advertising Review Board of 50 members (including non-advertising representatives). The board will work to prevent false advertising and to guide in such matters as taste. The board has empowered itself to recommend action by the Federal Trade Commission, where voluntary compliance cannot be gained.

Although many men in the advertising business worked on the program, Elting is credited with providing the key stimulus.

On its own, Quaker has adopted a comprehensive policy on nutrition, and how it must be explained through product labeling and advertising.

Here are two relevant excerpts from the policy:

"To the extent permitted by the law, the company will label all products which make a significant nutritional contribution to the diet with ingredient information."

"The advertising and promotion policy prohibits nutritional claims unless the product makes a significant contribution to the diet. It also prohibits the illusion of nutritional claims by implying excessive physical or psychological benefits or using such words as 'supercharged.'"

Why is Quaker oats such an "involved" company?

"It sounds trite, but it's good business," said Thurston. "We're still in business to make a profit. Nothing we do compromises that objective."

"There is often a basic misunderstanding of what it takes to make a buck today," Thurston said. And he clearly believes that a company that does not take into account the social impact of its business might not be around much longer in today's political climate.

PROPOSAL FOR RECONFIRMATION OF FEDERAL JUDGES

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in recent editions of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the Natchez, Miss., Democrat, and the Anderson, Ind., Herald, editorials were published discussing the merits of my proposal that Federal judges be subject to reconfirmation by the Senate every 8 years.

These and other editorial expressions are stimulating a healthy debate on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorials be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Sept. 9, 1971]

TO RESTORE REASON TO FEDERAL BENCH

The suggestion by Sen. Henry Byrd that the Senate review the qualifications of federal court judges every eight years merits serious consideration.

Under the existing laws, federal judges are appointed for life. They do not have to stand for reconfirmation, giving them powers not associated with other members of the judiciary.

It is Byrd's contention that periodic review is needed because in recent years federal judges have increasingly ignored "the unwritten canon of judicial restraint . . ."

The conservative minded independent from Virginia said too many members of the federal bench have assumed more and more power, with some undertaking administrative and political authority.

"The revolution which began in the Supreme Court has permeated the lower federal courts," Byrd said. "Judges of these courts have, in many cases, arrogantly assumed unto themselves the prerogatives of

lords of the Middle Ages. Nothing exists in our system at present to control these judges . . ."

The Virginia senator charged that too often the hallmark of the modern court has been power, not reason.

It is opportune that Byrd's suggestion comes at a time when the Supreme Court is not under the gun. His proposal can be considered in a cool and objective manner, as it should be. Rational construction of the federal bench is needed now more than perhaps at any time in our history.

[From the Natchez (Miss.) Democrat, Sept. 7, 1971]

COMMEND HARRY BYRD, JR.

The Legislature of the neighboring State of Alabama has adopted a resolution commending U.S. Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia for his proposal to limit the terms of federal judges through a constitutional amendment.

Judges now serve life terms but Senator Byrd would make them subject to reconfirmation by the Senate every eight years after a review of their performances.

The Alabama Legislature's resolution voiced growing nationwide resentment of usurpation of power by many federal judges who trespass on authority reserved to the states and to the executive and legislative branches of federal government.

As Senator Byrd said in proposing his constitutional amendment plan to limit judicial power, many federal courts in recent years have apparently acted under the pretense that the Constitution is whatever they say it is at the moment.

Prayer has been swept from our schools; the historic right of a state legislature to redistrict itself has been abolished; sociological theories have replaced written laws and traditional equity powers have been enlarged to allow rule by judicial whim.

Senator Byrd's arguments in behalf of his proposed constitutional amendment raise logical points which our own Senators Eastland, Stennis and other concerned statesmen have been stressing in tireless efforts for reform.

In casting aside the traditional doctrine of judicial restraint federal courts have assumed what often amount to dictatorial powers. Since they are not accountable anyone, it is certainly in order for Congress and the American people to impose realistic restraints.

[From the Anderson (Ind.) Herald, Sept. 12, 1971]

FEDERAL JUDGE RECONFIRMATION—

Sen. Harry Byrd of Virginia, an Independent, has proposed a constitutional amendment that would allow the U.S. Senate to reconfirm federal judges every eight years. They are currently appointed for life.

In making his proposal the senator said: "It is time we made federal judges more responsible to the people. Too many have assumed more and more power—and have run rampant in asserting authority over the daily lives of all Americans . . . In recent years the federal courts have acted under the premise that the Constitution is whatever the judges say it is."

We feel that Byrd's amendment would be a wise move because in recent years most federal judges have ignored what the senator terms "the unwritten canon of judicial restraint, as expressed by such great justices as Holmes, Brandeis, Hughes, Cardozo and Frankfurter."

This restraint, he says, "was one of our most hallowed legal principles."

As is the case with most lifetime appointments, the federal judgeships have long been considered somewhat sacred. Quite often federal judges continue to serve beyond an age when their reasoning is sound. In other

instances, some younger men have used the posts to gain power and rather than rule on the basis of the law have used the federal bench to enforce their own personal views.

Sen. Byrd notes that "Prayer has been swept from our schools; the historic right of a legislature to redistrict itself has been abolished; sociological treatises have replaced the common law; tradition equity powers have been enlarged to allow rule by judicial fiat."

Mr. Justice Cardozo once said that if judges are permitted to substitute their personal sense of justice for rules of law, the reign of law will end and the rule of benevolent despots will begin. He was so right. We are witnessing just such a happening in many areas today.

It is obvious that in too many cases we are witnessing the modern court ignoring reason to exert power. A perfect example are the rulings recently in several federal courts about busing of school children.

Indianapolis can be cited as one of those instances where unless busing, against the will of parents and students of both races, just for the sake of attaining a racial balance on a large scale, has been ordered.

Since people have the freedom to select the neighborhood in which they live, why wouldn't it be wiser and more reasonable to rule on the school integration issue on a school district basis—that is, seeing that the ratio of black and white students in each school is equivalent to the ratio of black and white school age children residing within that district—be just as fair and a lot more practical?

Byrd, bolstering his argument for the amendment, said: "The revolution which began in the Supreme Court has permeated the lower federal courts. Judges in these courts have, in many cases, arrogantly assumed unto themselves the prerogatives of lords of the Middle Ages. Nothing in our system at present exists to control these judges. They have lifetime appointments. Their passions of the moment are unrestrained."

Citing instances, Byrd said some judges have even undertaken administrative and political authority.

One court ordered a state to forego the election of a local officials, though the issue never had been presented to the court by any of the parties involved.

"One federal judge," Byrd said, "has stated that he is contemplating the consolidation of the school systems of two counties and one city. If this can be done, what is to prevent the judicial enforcement of total mergers of cities and counties?"

Naturally the judges will oppose such an amendment because they do not wish to be required to answer for their decisions. They will argue that making them immune from reconfirmation allows them to make their rulings without thought to any outside pressures.

The basic premise of that reasoning is sound and that is undoubtedly one of the reasons their appointments were originally for life. But, on the other hand, judges are human. Some are weaker than others. Some want justice and others want power. And, all too often permanency in a position brings out the despot in an individual. That is what has been happening in some of our federal courts.

Sen. Byrd's proposal should be given very serious consideration.

SUPPORT OF H.R. 10784

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor

of this bill, which will amend the District of Columbia Election Act of 1955, as amended, in several important and timely respects.

The first provision of this bill will amend the residency period required for voter qualification in the District of Columbia. The present District of Columbia Election Act provides in part that a qualified elector—that is, one who is qualified to register to vote—must be a U.S. citizen who has resided or has been domiciled in the District of Columbia continuously since the beginning of the 1-year period ending on the day of the next election. This 1-year residency requirement has been in effect since this law was originally written in 1955, and until quite recently it was considered to apply to voting in all elections in the District of Columbia. Two recent developments, however, have upset this concept of a uniform residency requirement, and thrown the system of voter registration in the District into confusion.

I wish to point out that under present law, voters in the District of Columbia are entitled to participate in elections for President and Vice President, for the District of Columbia Delegate to the House of Representatives, for members of the Board of Education, and, in addition, and in May of each presidential election year in party primaries to elect local party officials, delegates to the presidential nominating conventions, national committeemen and committee-women, and on so-called party questions. As I have stated, the residency requirements in all these elections has been 1 year, until in the past year.

The first change in this uniform 1-year requirement occurred in June of 1970, when the Congress enacted Public Law 91-285, which determined in effect that in the case of presidential elections, a durational residency requirement of more than 30 days was "constitutionally abhorrent." In that legislation, the Congress directed that each State provide by law for the registration of its duly qualified residents on the basis of a 30-day residency requirement, for presidential elections; and that legislative edict specifically included the District of Columbia in the definition of "State." Hence, this act included a clear congressional statement of policy, at least, that the 30-day residency requirement should apply to presidential elections here in the District of Columbia, as in all the States.

The second event which affected the existing residency requirement occurred in November of 1970, when the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, in its decision on the case of Lester against Board of Elections, held that the 1-year residency requirement for voting in the elections for nonvoting District of Columbia Delegate to the House of Representatives was unconstitutional. As a result of this decision, a number of people who had not lived in the District of Columbia for as long as a year registered and voted in the initial primary and general elections for District of Columbia Delegate in January and March of this year. As a matter of fact, although the court did not specify any definite period of residency less than 1 year

which might be imposed for voters in Delegate elections, the District of Columbia Board of Elections decided to adopt a 30-day period as the standard. At this time, however, this policy is not a matter of law.

At this time, therefore, the registration and participation of voters in the District of Columbia in the various elections in which they may vote is subject to three different requirements—30 days for participation in the elections for President and Vice President, some indefinite period less than 1 year for elections of District of Columbia Delegate to the House of Representatives, and 1 year for elections of Board of Education members and for the party primaries. This conglomerate situation obviously will cause confusion and difficulty on the part of the election officials and the voters alike.

In order to alleviate this problem, the first section of H.R. 10784 provides a 30-day residency requirement for voters in the elections for President and Vice President, in accordance with the congressional mandate referred to above; and a requirement of 6 months of continuous residence for all other elections.

I regard these provisions as both adequate and reasonable. As for the 30-day requirement of residence for participation in the elections for President and Vice President, aside from the fact that this is virtually a compliance with the dictates of Federal law, inasmuch as the issues involved in these elections are national in nature and scope, they are readily understandable by all people regardless of their place of residence. For this reason, I can see no difficulty with the 30-day period of residence in this connection. Since all the other elections held in the District of Columbia are purely local in nature, however, I feel strongly that this same 30-day period of residence would not be adequate to assure that the voters could have the opportunity to become sufficiently informed as to the issues and the candidates in these elections for members of the Board of Education, the District of Columbia nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and the various issues in the party primaries. Hence, I believe that the requirement of 6 months of residence for participation in these elections of a local character is a proper one.

These provisions for residency requirements will at least reduce the confusion and multiplicity of registration books to a considerable extent, and also will put the District in compliance with the 1970 amendments to the Voting Rights Act and with the U.S. court decision in the Lester case.

The second provision of H.R. 10784 will reduce the minimum age required in the District of Columbia Election Act for voter participation in the District of Columbia from 21 years to 18 years of age.

Public Law 91-285, which was approved in June of 1970, amended the Voting Rights Act to provide that citizens who are otherwise qualified to vote, and are at least 18 years of age, may vote in Federal elections held on or after January 1, 1971. Then on July 5, 1971, the certification of the 26th amendment to the U.S. Constitution extended the fran-

chise to 18-year-old citizens in all elections.

Hence, this provision in H.R. 10784 is pro forma, and merely a technical change to make the District of Columbia statute conform to existing law.

The third and final provision of H.R. 10784 will extend the date for runoff elections for candidates for the District of Columbia Board of Education from 21 days after the general election as presently specified, to 28 days subsequent to such general election.

I am not surprised that this period of 3 weeks between the general election and a runoff in the case of school board candidates has proved too short. The law permits any candidate to petition the Board of Elections for a recount of the votes at any time within 7 days after the election, or he may petition the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia during that same period of time to review the election results. Since it takes the Board of Elections several days normally to certify the results of the election, it is obvious that such a petition either to the Board or to the court, if filed 7 days after such certification, would actually occupy at least half of the 21-day period before the runoff election would have to be held. And only after the completion of such a recount or review would it be possible even to know whether or not a runoff would be called for, and if so, which candidates would be eligible to compete in the runoff. Thus, little time indeed would remain for the Board of Elections to prepare for the runoff and for the candidates to campaign for such election.

In the case of elections for District of Columbia Delegate to the House of Representatives, the District of Columbia election law provides that the Board of Elections may set the date for a runoff election at any time between 2 and 6 weeks after certification of the results of the general election. However, I do not believe that this provision would be suitable in the case of School Board elections, as has been provided in S. 2495 recently approved by the Senate. In the first place, runoff elections are much more likely to be necessary for School Board candidates, partially because in such an election the leading candidate must receive a majority of the votes cast in order to avoid a runoff, whereas in an election for District of Columbia Delegate, a candidate must receive only 40 percent of the vote in order to be elected. The uncertainty as to the date for such a runoff election, when the Board of Elections has the option of a 4-week period within which to schedule the runoff, is undesirable in my opinion, from the standpoint of the Board as well as that of the candidates themselves. If one candidate should wish the runoff to be held as early as possible, and the other wished more time for campaigning, then the Board of Elections would be subject to criticism and charges of favoritism regardless of the date determined for the runoff. By contrast, the 28-day period set by H.R. 10784 is both adequate and reasonable.

It is inevitable that the District of Columbia Election Act will have to be amended from time to time. It is a relatively new law, and its provisions are, of course, subject to trial and error. The amendments provided in H.R. 10784 are to some extent the result of experience gained in the relatively few elections which have been held under this act, and to some degree the result of other legislation and certain court decisions. All these provisions are timely, and constructive efforts to meet these changing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of my colleagues for the passage of this proposed legislation.

OVERHAUL OF NATION'S WELFARE SYSTEM

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, ever since the administration first put forward its proposal for a major overhaul of the Nation's welfare system, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long), chairman of the Committee on Finance, has made a number of sound suggestions and contributions to the debate on this subject.

In an interview with Mr. Frank Van der Linden, Washington bureau chief of the Nashville Banner, Senator Long once again has offered cogent observations about the administration's welfare plan.

I was especially impressed with this comment by Senator Long in the interview:

Now we will try to pass some real welfare reform legislation, not that scheme which would make welfare more attractive than work.

I think that comment by Senator Long sums up much of the objection which many members of the Finance Committee, and indeed many people all across the country, have with regard to the administration's plan. Senator Long is proposing a plan of his own as a substitute for the administration's proposal. He outlines the essentials of this plan in the interview with Mr. Van der Linden.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Van der Linden's article, "Nixon Tax Cut Package Next," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Sept. 7, 1971]

NIXON TAX CUT PACKAGE NEXT

(By Frank Van der Linden)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's welfare reform bill is being sidetracked in the Senate, at least until 1972, to make way for the new "Nixon Express"—his tax-cut package aimed at stimulating the economy.

The senators are going along with the President's request that Congress postpone the effective date of the welfare bill for a

year, and his revenue-sharing plan for three months. These are major items in the \$4.7 billion Federal spending cut which he ordered to offset the revenue loss from the tax reductions.

Some Senate Finance Committee members, who bitterly oppose the President's welfare bill to guarantee a \$2,400 annual income for each family of four, are delighted to delay it until next year, and perhaps even later.

"We were going to delay it anyhow," Chairman Russell Long said with an ironic laugh. "It's nice of the President to take the pressure off. Now we will try to pass some real welfare reform legislation, not that scheme which would make welfare more attractive than work."

Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., the Virginia Independent on the committee, said: "Nixon has taken the graceful way out. He has acknowledged that his new welfare program would be inflationary and expensive, costing about six billion dollars a year. Now we should drop the whole thing."

Long said Congress agreed with the President that the present Aid to Families with Dependent Children is "a mess" and must be reformed. AFDC recipients have skyrocketed from 3,073,000 in 1960 to 9,660,000 in 1970.

But the Louisiana senator said figures from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare indicated the children on welfare would rise still further, to 19 million, while the total of people on the welfare rolls would jump from 13 million to 26 million, under the Nixon plan.

The House of Representatives passed the welfare bill last June, despite opposition by conservatives who said it would cost too much and liberals who said it would give the poor too little.

The measure also requires that able-bodied welfare recipients must register and accept jobs offered to them. But one insisted those requirements were "a farce," because "the Labor Department's record in placing welfare recipients in jobs is very, very poor."

The Louisiana senator proposes a new approach—to supplement the wages of low-income workers.

He said: "This is how my new bill would work: Say a father is earning \$1.40 an hour but still can't earn enough to support his family. We would add sixty cents to make that \$2 an hour. His check from his employer would include a voucher for the Federal supplement. It would be a reward for working, not for loafing."

"There are jobs all over America, begging for people to fill them," Long went on. "People should take those jobs, even though they may be called 'menial.' If a man will do the honorable thing, my bill would add to his earnings. Under the Administration bill, he would lose about eighty cents of each dollar he earned, because the family assistance payment would be reduced accordingly."

Long proposes to split the House-passed welfare package and have the Senate approve the sections "we can agree on," including a five per cent increase in Social Security benefits, while postponing Nixon's Family Assistance Plan into the dim, distant future.

He also plans action on the President's new tax-cut package as soon as it comes over from the House, which is expected to enact it in late September.

Its three main points are:

(1) A speed-up in personal exemption increases and higher deductions, estimated to provide individual taxpayers with \$4.8 billion per year, effective January 1.

(2) Repeal of the seven per cent excise tax on automobile sale, to be retroactive to August 15.

(3) A tax credit of 10 per cent for one year, and a five per cent credit for ensuing years, on investments in new American-made equipment and machinery.

ATTACKS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, my district has been saddened, because we have had three police officers shot by armed robbers in the past week. Two of these men have died, and the third one is in serious condition. The result is that many of our good people are looking for answers.

I am pleased to place in the RECORD a statement by the wife of one policeman, Mrs. Edward Sneed, of Edison, N.J., who, like many others, would be very anxious to do something about this situation:

WHO ARE THE LAWS PROTECTING?

Today, I attended the funeral of the Police Officer who was killed, or to be quite frank, brutally, uselessly murdered! I was filled with mixed emotions for his family and those who loved him, and hatred for the laws that are indirectly responsible for this tragedy. If you are asking why, I'll tell you.

This needn't have happened, if, and I might add, the if's are numerous.

If, the Police were issued proper and adequate equipment rather than those they now use, which are inferior.

If, the windows of the patrol cars were bullet proof, as are those of the higher echelon, the police face dangers untold and unknown every hour they are on duty and off as well. Are their lives meaningless because they are only patrolmen? Are they more easily replaced? If you think this, then ask some of their wives and those women who were made widows, how they feel?

If, the courts and the law stood behind the police, where they rightfully belong, and backed them up with any and all charges the patrolman brings against a criminal offender, instead of trying to win a popularity contest, at the expense of the patrolmen. Do you wonder then, why there is no respect for the policemen and the law they try to uphold?

If, the court laws did not protect the criminal with a law, that is beyond being called ridiculous, that every law offender arrested, be given his "constitutional rights," lest he be freed of any and all charges. A criminal offender does not warrant any rights, he forfeits these rights, the minute he engages in breaking the law. He is, and should be treated for what he is, a criminal offender!

If, the judges who sit in judgment of these offenders, would bear in mind that the law breaker before them is not there for jaywalking, but on charges that warrant severe punishment. They would also be wise to eliminate from their vocabulary the sentences of "on probation, and sentence suspended." Is our need for a Police Force to have the Patrolmen apprehend these offenders, only to have them released to society, by lenient judges and laws that now work in reverse? That being, protect the guilty and punish the innocent? For that is precisely what has just happened to these two patrolmen, who were very conscientiously doing their job, with inadequate equipment. I might add! One was murdered and the other seriously wounded, because of a law that made it possible for a degenerate

—, who was in prison for committing a murder, and was serving a life sentence, mind you now, not a death sentence, as he justly deserved, but a life sentence! He was also, after too short a time made a trustee! Had he been given the death sentence, he justly deserved, he would not have been in the convenient position, to have committed

his second murder. Are the courts now satisfied?

The biggest and most hideous error the courts can make, is to approve and pass the abolishment of the capitol punishment law! With the approval of this law, the crime rate can only go one way, and that is up! Which is where it's going.

If a person, regardless of who he is related to, be it the congressman, the governor, or the President, commits an act of breaking the law, he should be treated accordingly, and not have the law changed to protect him from punishment.

Now, I ask you, who has the free rein in your community, in controlling the crime rate. Is it the criminal offender or the law enforcers?

As citizens of your community, you have not only the right but the means to demand tighter laws, laws that will protect you against these degenerate offenders, many of which are repeating offenders who escape their just punishment through the legality and protection of the courts!

Petition your officials, the congressmen, senators, governors, and the President himself! Insist that the police be given, once again the power and authority that he might be better able to do the job that he is qualified for, to uphold the law and make your community a safer place, that you might raise your children in safety! Demand that they untie his hands, so that he can do his job! Demand also more efficient equipment, protection of bullet proof windows, sentences that fit the crime, a tighter gun control, capitol punishment and anything I might have omitted!

It not only is your right, but it is your duty, to demand these issues, for your community. Do your part in helping the law enforcers of your town achieve the means to make it safer for you! Lest you lose sight as to who or what a Policeman is, I'll tell you.

He is the one you call when your child is hurt, ill, or lost. He is the one you call when your neighbor looks at you disapprovingly, when your being abused in any way. He is the one who leaves his family on holidays, that they celebrate alone, he is out in weather ranging from a sweltering 100 degrees to sub-freezing, ice slicked roads to torrential downpours. Weather, you yourself wouldn't go out in, but when you need help, you expect him to answer your call and solve whatever problem you hand him. He acts as many things to you, he is a sense of security, a clergyman, a referee and countless other professions he must fill in for. He is someone that is held up to ridicule, demeaned personally, verbally abused, and harassed. But he continues to answer your call for help. But please bear in mind, he is also a human being with feelings and the right to live!

If you think I feel strongly about these men and the issue involved, well I do! My husband is a patrolman, and like many other police wives, take pride in what he is and stands for. But he is also, the father of my children, and I want neither to be a statistical widow, nor do I want my children to be fatherless.

Believe me a flag, that a widow receives is a small comfort to her, and by far, not an even exchange.

HOW WE CAN REDUCE OR ELIMINATE THE NEED FOR THE DRAFT IN THE ARMY

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned over the correct solutions

to problems regarding our national defense, especially the methods for achieving adequate manpower strength within our defense structure. After having recently spent many hours on legislation extending the selective service draft system for an additional 2 years, the Congress is especially aware of the many problems involved in establishing an effective program for attracting and retaining capable and willing military personnel. An individual who has had vast experience in such matters, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, retired, has recently shared his thoughts with me on how we can reduce or eliminate the need for the draft, and I share his ideas with my colleagues at this time by having them inserted in the RECORD:

HOW WE CAN REDUCE OR ELIMINATE THE NEED FOR THE DRAFT IN THE ARMY?

1. Congress establishes the size of the United States Army.

2. It then supports measures to raise the numbers it authorizes.

3. The Policy of the Administration is:

(a) To do everything practicable to make military service attractive in order to encourage enlistments and reenlistments.

(b) To fill the deficit by an equitable Selective Service System in being.

4. The Army's attitude is to do everything practicable to support the Administration's policy. Increasing the percentage of enlistees in the Army is to the Army's and our country's benefit, even if we do not fill 100% of the requirements in that way.

5. Improving leadership in the Army is a part of the Army's policy for a Modern Volunteer Army.

6. We can cut the number necessary to be drafted to the extent that we can fill our requirements by reenlistments and enlistments. Every man who reenlists or enlists reduces the Draft by one.

7. The Army will do its best to increase enlistments and is dedicated to doing that, but since enlistment is a personal matter whereby the young man signs a contract to serve his country, he must receive a great part of his motivation to enlist from congressmen, senators, educators, the media, clergy, his family and his neighbors. When all effectively carry out the part they must play, the Draft can gradually be reduced to zero.

8. There must be an effective cooperative effort between the military and the public to secure the enlistments necessary to reduce or eliminate the Draft. The Army is and will continue to do its part in this effort.

9. The Army needs our people to do their part in this national effort.

SPECIAL ORDER: JUSTICE HUGO BLACK

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, a great guardian of our constitutional process passed away last week. I plan to take a special order for Monday, October 4, in order to pay tribute to the late Justice Hugo Black.

I would welcome the participation of any of my colleagues who wish to join in the commemorative special order.

U.N. MEMBERSHIP

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, several colleagues and I rose to support House Concurrent Resolution 322, sponsored by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE). This resolution calls for the United States to initiate and to support high-level studies for the review of the United Nations Charter. As I pointed out in my remarks at that time, one of the most pressing areas for Charter review is that of admission to the General Assembly. Prof. Stephen M. Schwebel of the School of Advanced International Studies, the Johns Hopkins University, was written on this very same subject in the Washington Post for September 26, 1971.

Professor Schwebel contends that if the U.N. is to continue as a viable world organization, the policy of universal admissions should be taken in hand. He says:

The Assembly's stock tends to depreciate as the bonds of its membership widen. Universality is not to be confused with ubiquity.

As a possible solution to this dilemma, Schwebel speaks of associate membership in the United Nations for the mini-states, an idea that I believe worthy of consideration.

I commend this excellent article to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

QUESTION OF RULES FOR "MEANINGFUL U.N. MEMBERSHIP"—WHAT SHOULD THE U.N. DO ABOUT THE MINI-STATES?

(By Stephen M. Schwebel)

Fifty years ago, the Assembly of the League of Nations demonstrated a lot more sense than did the General Assembly of the United Nations last week. The issue then, as now, was the status of the mini-states.

Liechtenstein was denied admission to the League by a vote which followed upon a report made to the assembly. That report stated that "Liechtenstein has been recognized de jure by many states. She has considered a number of treaties . . . The Principality of Liechtenstein possesses a stable government and fixed frontiers . . . There can be no doubt that juridically the Principality of Liechtenstein is a sovereign state, but by reason of her limited area, small population, and her geographical position, she has chosen to devote to others some of the attributes of sovereignty . . . Liechtenstein has no army. For the above reasons, we are of the opinion that the Principality of Liechtenstein could not discharge all the international obligations which would be imposed on her by the covenant."

The General Assembly of the United Nations has just voted to admit Qatar to membership (along with Bahrain and Bhutan). The unanimous recommendation of the Security Council on which this action was based shows no signs of the judiciousness which characterized the League's proceedings of 1920. By 1920, Liechtenstein had been more or less independent for 200 years; by 1971, Qatar had been independent for some weeks. The population of Liechtenstein (not a U.N. member any more than it was a League member) is about 21,000; that of Qatar, about 80,000. Qatar's approximately 4,000 square miles—only an approximation, since its frontiers, unlike Liechtenstein's, not only are not stable but not even

fully delineated—are much more than Liechtenstein's 62 square miles. They are also far less fertile. Liechtenstein is highly industrialized and richly agricultural; its gross national product compares favorably with Qatar's (which is based virtually alone on oil); it has no illiteracy and Qatar has much. It has had long if limited experience in international relations; Qatar virtually none.

Why the difference in result? Why are the established European mini-states largely out and the new Asian and African mini-states increasingly in?

It cannot be because the mini-states currently in vogue are any more able to carry out the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations than the older mini-states were able to carry out those of the League Covenant. On the contrary, the obligations imposed upon U.N. members are much greater than those imposed on members of the League.

The essential theory of the covenant was that the League Council would adopt decisions on the basis of unanimity (apart from the disputants) but that the League Members themselves would be left to apply the League Covenant in the light of the findings of League organs. The essential theory of the United Nations is that the Security Council, on which only the five permanent members have a veto, can bind all members, large and small, to take the action the council decides upon to maintain or restore international peace and security.

The activities of the United Nations are far more diversified, intensive and expensive than were those of the League. The burdens of meaningful U.N. membership are much more substantial than were those of the League. This is illustrated by the fact that it is U.N. practice for members to maintain permanent missions at its headquarters; this was not the custom of the League. Its relatively episodic program did not demand them.

Membership in the United Nations, Article 4 of the Charter provides, is open to "peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

What sort of Judgment is it that moves the organization to conclude that Qatar or Bahrain (population, 195,000, area, 231 square miles) are able and willing to carry out the obligations of the charter—to "fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter," such as the obligation to give the United Nations "every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter . . ."? Or that the Maldives Islands, admitted to membership in 1965—population, circa 100,000, capacities to do most anything international, virtually zero—can fulfill charter obligations? If the United Nations did not have the improvident rule of paying the cost of transport of five delegates from each member to each General Assembly, there is room for doubt about whether the Maldives could mount the resources to ferry a delegation to New York to cast the equal vote it there enjoys with the United States and the Soviet Union.

When the representative of the United States in the Security Council unwisely supported the admission of the Maldives, he wisely stated: "Today many of the small emerging entities, however willing, probably do not have the human or economic resources at this stage to meet this second criterion [the ability to carry out charted obligations]. We would therefore urge that Council Members and other United Nations members give early and careful consideration to this problem in an effort to arrive at some agreed standards, some lower limits, to be applied in the case of future applicants for United Nations membership."

Secretary General U Thant expanded upon this theme in 1967. "I would suggest," he submitted in his annual report, "that it may

be opportune for the competent organs to undertake a thorough and comprehensive study of the criteria for membership in the United Nations, with a view to laying down the necessary limitations on full membership while also defining other forms of association which would benefit both the 'microstates' and the United Nations."

In December of that year, the United States addressed a letter to the president of the Security Council referring to these remarks of the secretary general, suggesting that the time had come to examine the question in terms of general principles and procedures and further suggesting that the council's dormant Committee on Membership be revived to that end.

But little—apart from production of an able study on the subject by the U.N. Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)—has happened since. The Security Council has talked, but not acted. The sole refreshing fact in this dismal history is that stalemate, for once, seems to be the fault neither of the Soviet Union nor France. As far as can be gleaned, resistance to curbing the continuing influx of mini-states lies in London, and in its perception—or that of its former Colonial Office—that its remaining colonies now out, and its former colonies now in, will be offended if emerging mini-states are denied U.N. membership. And it is likely that the British are right in believing that many members of the General Assembly welcome additions, however minor, to their majorities. The fashion is decolonization at all costs (especially if they are paid by the developed states); and how independent can a new nation be without the status symbol of a U.N. vote?

To be sure, a very few mini-states have exercised a restraint which has escaped the United Nations. Western Samoa, which became independent in 1962, has refrained from applying for membership, despite a population and area exceeding that of a few U.N. members (137,000; 1,097 square miles). And independent Nauru, with a population of some 6,000 and an area of about 8 square miles, also has not applied for membership, though its phosphates give it perhaps the highest per capita income in the world.

What is to be done about the rest—if not those already in, the score of more of "bits and pieces" of dissolving empires that may come in if the present absence of standards is maintained?

First, such territories should be encouraged not to opt for independence where they lack the resources and the situation property to maintain it. Here, much though not all, depends on the attitudes dominant in United Nations organs. Those attitudes have not been adequately responsible; the emphasis upon independence as the only respectable alternative to colonialism has been, though not total, excessive.

Second, independence should not be equated with U.N. membership. Samoa has set a standard which others should apply. The United Nations can render technical assistance, the World Bank can invest, the U.N. Specialized Agencies can give their specialized services, to small territories which are not U.N. members. Indeed, mini-states could have an observer or even an associate, non-voting status at the United Nations—without charter amendment, and without the burdens of membership.

Third, if mini-states nevertheless continue to apply for membership, and if standards regulating their admission continue to elude United Nations consensus, the United States should abandon consensus. Acting with the support of as many members as it can attract, it should develop the secretary general's case for calling a halt to the admission of mini-states. As necessary, it should use its veto in the Security Council to block the admission of additional mini-states, at any rate pending the establishment of acceptable minimal standards for admission.

The issue is of consequence if the General

Assembly is to be of consequence. The Assembly's stock tends to depreciate as the bonds of its membership widen. Universality is not to be confused with ubiquity. The case for seating the Peoples Republic of China, or admitting the divided states of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, adds nothing to the case for admitting more mini-states. The value of the two-thirds majority, once a safeguard for the larger states, and the larger minorities, progressively cheapens as the ability of minor states to dispose of General Assembly votes grows. U.N. resolutions can increasingly be adopted by states lacking the responsibility for implementing them. That cannot be to the benefit of effective international organization. If the United Nations cannot bring itself to act in its own larger interests, then the United States should bring itself to act in the United Nations' larger interests, ideally, that's what the veto is for.

IS THERE A MILITARY MANPOWER CRISIS?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the House have had the experience of receiving a constituent request from a veteran who wishes to return to active service, making the necessary inquiries in his behalf, and seeing the military turn down this volunteering veteran for some reason or other.

Yet, and this is most strange, this Congress passed on September 21 and sent to the President a bill extending the military draft.

The military insists that the draft is necessary to avoid a manpower crisis, yet often refuses the request of a veteran to return to active service. We also frequently see trained servicemen given "early outs," or a discharge before the end of their service obligation.

This is, on the face of it, contradictory and raises the question of the present purpose of the military. Is the military mission to provide a trained force to defend this country, or is it being exploited as a means to indoctrinate young men? Approaching this same question from the economic standpoint causes many people to wonder if the new military exists simply to combat unemployment and check inflation.

I include a related news article detailing this contradiction between what the military says and what it does at this point in the RECORD:

The article follows:

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 25, 1971]

MANPOWER CRISIS?—ARMY BARS VETERANS AS LAIRD PUSHES DRAFT

While Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird was warning Congress of a serious military manpower crisis unless the draft was renewed, the Army was telling its recruiters to turn away veterans wanting to re-enlist.

"Current re-enlistments of individuals on active duty are sufficient to maintain the career-content of the Army under its reduced structure. Thus, there is no present need for the enlistment of prior service personnel from the civilian community."

These were the instructions in a Sept. 14 letter from Maj. Gen. A. H. Smith of the Army's personnel office to the recruiting

command at Ft. Monroe Va. The orders then were passed on to recruiting officers across the country.

Four days earlier Laird wrote Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman John C. Stennis, D-Miss., urging immediate passage of the draft bill "in the interest of national security."

Laird said the readiness of the Army would be affected beginning in January by a shortage of trained men who could be assigned to units.

LAIRD'S LETTER

The bill renewing the draft for two years, was approved by the Senate Tuesday and is awaiting President Nixon's signature.

"There may be some seeming inconsistencies," Pentagon spokesman Daniel Z. Henkin conceded yesterday, "as a manpower needs of the Army and the other services are realigned in light of continuing withdrawals from Vietnam and manpower reductions directed by Congress."

He added, "As we've said we need the draft to bring in new men and we also need to take actions to improve the over-all caliber of the armed forces while at the same time they are being reduced by more than a million men."

The Army is budgeted to shrink to 892,000 men by June, down from its 1968 Vietnam war peak of 1.5 million.

HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT

Henkin said Laird, who has been pushing the administration's effort to find jobs for returning Vietnam veterans, was unaware of the recruiting order. There are currently 310,000 Vietnam-era veterans between the ages of 20 and 29 unemployed, according to the Labor Department. As a group they have the second highest rate of unemployment, 8.2 percent compared to the national rate of about 6 percent.

Gen. Smith's Sept. 14 order applies only to veterans wanting to come back into the service and not to young men signing up for the first time. The Army figures it will need 20,000 new men a month if it is to end reliance on the draft and become an all volunteer force by mid-1973.

But it would seem the Army would prefer taking veterans since they are already trained and the expense of training new men could thus be saved. This would be in keeping with arguments favoring an all-volunteer force which, proponents contend, would reduce personnel turnover by keeping men in service longer and thereby cut training costs.

"We still need people, there's no question about that," an Army spokesman said. "But we need enlistees for the combat arms. Otherwise we'll be top heavy with sergeants and no privates."

TOO MANY SERGEANTS

Veterans coming back into the service—20,000 did last year—would retain their old rank. A man with two or more years prior service would in most cases be a sergeant E-4 or E-5.

There are two exceptions to the order barring veterans. The Army will take back men trained in any of 18 critical job skills. Mostly in electronics, and those holding either of the three highest combat awards—the Silver Star, Distinguished Cross or Medal of Honor.

MAJ. GEN. LAVERNE WEBER ASSUMES COMMAND OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, another outstanding Oklahoman has been selected for a position of national leader-

ship. Maj. Gen. LaVerne Weber of Lone Wolf, Okla., State commander of the National Guard for the last 6 years, has been chosen to head the U.S. Army Guard forces.

General Weber will assume command in mid-October of the more than 400,000 national guardsmen, after beginning his career in World War II as a Marine Corps private and receiving promotion to the rank of second lieutenant in 1945. Following the Korean war, during which time he served with the 45th Division of the activated Oklahoma National Guard and advanced to the rank of major, LaVerne Weber returned and took a full-time post with the Oklahoma Military Department. He was appointed Oklahoma State Adjutant General in 1965, and since that time has served with the highest distinction as Oklahoma's top-ranking military official.

Mr. Speaker, the increasingly important role of the U.S. Military Reserves is becoming well recognized by both the Congress and the administration, and I can think of no higher honor for General Weber than his selection at this critically important time to assume command of the Army National Guard.

His unquestioned integrity, excellent leadership skills and thorough dedication make him remarkably well qualified for his new command position. I know all Oklahomans regret the loss of General Weber's services to our State, but at the same time, I also know that each and every Oklahoman feels pride in seeing him selected for this important national leadership post.

TAX CREDITS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation I sponsored in the 91st Congress to provide a tax credit for college tuition expenses.

Under this proposal, a credit of up to \$325 per year would be allowed for qualified taxpayers financing a college education. The full credit would be provided to taxpayers with incomes at or below \$15,000 a year. Over \$15,000 the credit would be reduced gradually until it disappeared completely for those earning more than \$25,000. However, persons financing more than one college student could receive a credit for each student.

This legislation is designed primarily to assist low- and moderate-income families who are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the soaring costs of higher education. Average costs this year for tuition, room, and board at public colleges have reached almost \$1,500. At private schools, the annual cost now is well over \$3,000. Moreover, the U.S. Office of Education estimates that tuition alone will increase by 25 percent at public institutions of higher learning and by 38 percent at private institutions over the next 10 years.

Tax credits would also be allowed, under my bill, for vocational and business

schools and they would be available to students working to put themselves through school as well as parents financing their children's education.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation would constitute a worthwhile investment in our Nation's future. Education is our greatest natural resource—it provides the hope for the future and is responsible for the achievements of the past.

AMCHITKA AND TRIBALISM

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the impending underground nuclear explosion on Amchitka Island in the Aleutians has been the subject of much controversy. I am one who strongly opposes such a test and who feels that its far-reaching ramifications should be of concern to us all.

In my view, Norman Cousins' editorial in the September 25, 1971, issue of the *Saturday Review* entitled "Amchitka and Tribalism" presents an excellent discussion of this issue and similar questions in their inescapably global context. I wish to share the editorial with my colleagues:

AMCHITKA AND TRIBALISM

What is most characteristic of modern man is not his power but his powerlessness, not his ability to mobilize vast force but his inability to protect himself against it.

Consider the plan of the United States to detonate underground a nuclear bomb with the equivalent force of five million tons of TNT—a bomb 250 times more powerful than the explosive dropped on Hiroshima. The projected site of the explosion, Amchitka Island in the Aleutians, is closer to Canada, Japan, the Soviet Union, and China than it is to the continental United States. Citizens of those countries and, indeed, citizens from all over the world have expressed alarm. They have cited the apprehension of scientists over possible radioactive leakage into the atmosphere or the sea, with consequent effects of unpredictable damage to the food chain and to all forms of life. They are also worried that the explosion may trigger earthquakes or tidal waves.

These apprehensions may be wholly correct or wholly incorrect or partially incorrect. This is not what is most important. What is most important is that no impartial authority now exists for determining the validity of the charge or for protecting the human interest where it comes into conflict with the national interest. Where do human beings go to register their concern over possible harm to their habitat or to their lives that may be caused by a powerful nation? Do they go to the United States government itself? It is the United States government that proposes to do the exploding. The United States government is not an impartial authority in determining the accuracy of charges made about the risks of the Amchitka test. It is not a court of appeals. The President of the United States may bow to the weight of world public opinion and call off the tests, but this does not change the bizarre fact

that no supreme court or agency exists in the world today for considering questions that apply to the safety and welfare of mankind as a whole.

Should human beings bring their concern before the International Court of Justice? This court tries to resolve disputes between nations. The name of the agency is misleading. It is not in fact a court. It has no statutory law behind it and no enforcement machinery to support it. It is an arbitration agency that functions only in those cases where all parties to a dispute are willing to turn to it. Its decisions are not binding.

What about the United Nations? The United Nations has authorized a far-reaching world conference in Stockholm next year for the purpose of dealing with the mounting threats to the world environment. It is difficult to see how tests of nuclear explosions, whether in the air, sea, or underground, and by whatever nation, can be excluded from any consideration of world environmental hazards. But the Stockholm conference will have no authority to direct the United States, or the Soviet Union, or France, or China to forego future nuclear tests.

Here, then, is the tragic flaw in the organization of human society. The ultimate need on earth is for the protection and preservation of life. Yet, no workable authority exists beyond the nation. The nation arrogates to itself the authority and the power to decide what it does not only inside but outside its borders. What it does inside or outside its borders may constitute, as the Amchitka test illustrates, a possible danger to other people and to the world environment as a whole. But there is no legal process by which such danger can be averted. In a larger sense, there is no legal process by which human destiny can be protected and served.

The newspapers recently carried prominent accounts of a meeting of American and Soviet scientists for the purpose of "tuning in" on the universe. The meeting considered ways in which scientists could monitor the universe for signals from planets possibly intelligence and advanced communication skills. If contact with other planets should in fact be made, and if the earth-dwellers are able both to send and receive information, what shall we say about our life on earth? shall we say that we have developed a human intelligence to a point where we need fear only ourselves, that the most extensive exercise of collective brainpower is directed not to human needs but to ever-more advanced techniques for killing off humans, that the natural environment is being fouled at a prodigious rate, and that the earth-dwellers have never outgrown their tribalism, of which national sovereignty is an all-powerful manifestation?

Despite the historians, there has been only one age of man. It is the age of primitive man. The beginning of the age of civilized man, when it comes will be marked by his political, philosophical, and spiritual awareness of himself as a member of a world species with world needs and with the capacity and desire to create world institutions to meet these needs. Humankind need not sacrifice the nation to create such institutions. It need only recognize and assert an allegiance of humans to one another beyond national boundaries and to do those things in the human interest that the nation as an organization is incapable of doing.

The present mode of life on earth is madness, which is nonetheless lethal for being legal. Rational existence is possible, but it calls for a world consciousness and a world design. People who develop the habit of thinking of themselves as world citizens are fulfilling the first requirement of sanity in our time.

URBAN TRANSPORTATION

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE K. LEROY IRVIS, MAJORITY LEADER OF STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ADDRESS BEFORE FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION, PITTSBURGH, PA., SEPTEMBER 8, 1971

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. I am honored to appear before you, a group of people who have gathered from all over the world to discuss transportation in terms of mobility and freedom. Freedom to move—mobility—is in my opinion a subject of critical importance in our society and it is one in which I have been deeply involved for sometime.

"Freedom" is a state of being at liberty rather than in confinement or under physical restraint. Mobility is defined as the movement of people in a population, as from place to place, from job to job or from one social class to another. It is rather striking isn't it how similar the two definitions are. It all fits very nicely—if you have transportation, you have mobility and if you have mobility you have one of the essentials of freedom.

Man has always been limited to some extent by his mode of transportation. Our horizons were rather small when the world that we knew was restricted by how far we could walk. With the invention of the wheel, and the sail, and the wing, the world became larger, rounder and most importantly, a much more enjoyable place to inhabit. There is a definite relationship between the process of civilization, the development of man, and the discovery of more efficient ways of moving around in our environment. It is not a semantical game—if you or I or anyone else is going to be free in any sense of the word we must first be mobile.

It is, therefore, not surprising in this restless land dedicated from its inception to freedom, that we are the most mobile population on earth. Why, ask almost anyone and he will tell you nearly everybody in the United States has at least one car and we have accordingly developed a nationwide preoccupation with the construction of highways to carry these universally owned automobiles.

Well, I have some extremely disappointing news for anyone holding this belief. More than one third of our population, some 78 million people, do not possess this package of instant freedom, the automobile. These people must rely upon public transportation or they get no transportation at all. They are too poor, or too young, or too old, or handicapped and they are the ones who ride the buses—or try to—and for the most part they are the inhabitants of our cities.

It is a fact not often enough understood that 80 per cent of our entire population lives in one per cent of our land area, our major metropolitan areas. This being so, just who are we subsidizing when we invest tremendous sums of public money to make it convenient to drive an automobile between New York and San Francisco? No one commutes daily between these points even if they do possess an automobile. One has to question the wisdom of investing so much

public tax money to serve such a small percentage of the public.

I, for one intend to ask a lot of pointed questions, as long as I live in a city, as long as I represent the public and as long as I know children who live in the city but have never been downtown because there is no convenient or economic or even available means of getting there.

Only a few years past our cities were a source of national pride—great centers of culture, commerce, and growth. With the advent of the automobile age, the skilled worker, the man with the mobility options, deserted the city for the suburbs. Our city populations were suddenly isolated islands of the poor and unskilled, virtually imprisoned by their immobility. Even their places of employment—manufacturing, warehousing, hospitals, and department stores had moved to the suburbs beyond their economic reach and frequently beyond their extremely limited mobility. So there they sit and fester in the rotting cores of our cities, with the shopping center, the job opportunities, the decent housing tantalizing them just beyond their reach. Small wonder that frustration has sometimes boiled over into anti-social acts. Is it not predictable that certain city streets are not safe to walk at night?

This pattern, this situation, is worsening. The solution requires a multi-level approach but we had better not neglect one of the most fundamental methods of combating the problem—mass transit. And the systems that we develop must not only serve the commuter coming from the suburbs, but also the inner-city traveler and the worker whose job opportunities are outside the city limits.

If we do not, all of the expensive job training programs and far-sighted employee hiring policies will be ineffective. It must first be possible for the trained and deserving worker to get to the place of employment else the training is all bitter ashes. We must not become so enraptured with ideals that we forget the little realities necessary to make the ideal possible.

And as long as we are discussing reality we had better consider the revolutionary possibility of making public transportation really public. Mass transit should be as public as the police force, the school system or the fire department. No one has to pay the fire department a fee before it extinguishes a fire. Why should a person, who probably can least afford it have to pay a fare for public transportation? It is inconsistent to continue to demand a fare for something that became publicly owned chiefly because the fare box could no longer support private enterprise.

Children locked in ghettos, families who would travel if they could travel, commercial interests seeking employees and expanded markets, and suburbanites now divorced from urban involvement—all would share in the open avenue of communication and commerce provided by a really free public and modern systems of transportation.

And let us admit that the myth of the self-sustaining system has been exploded. No modern mass transit system can be self-sustaining.

Looking beyond the pocketbook, let us consider also that the most effective way to eliminate the congestion and pollution of the automobile jamming our city streets is to make mass transit truly competitive, that is make it frequent and free.

Free—yes I like that word. I like that state of being at liberty rather than in confinement. I like the idea of an open mobile society—one in which every man will be able to move from place to place, from job to job, and from social class to another. It all fits rather nicely—if a society can build adequate and available transportation it has mobility and if it has mobility it has an

element of freedom—and isn't that the real reason of all ages have always struggled and fought and sacrificed so that man can be free?

A VERY PERSUASIVE CASE FOR REPEAL OF THE 7 PERCENT FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee will soon be bringing to the floor for consideration legislation to help implement the President's new economic program. Included in the bill will be the repeal of the 7-percent Federal excise tax on automobiles. During the committee hearings former Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield, Sr., and his son, Arthur E. Summerfield, Jr., both automobile dealers of longstanding experience, made a very persuasive case for the need for this long overdue tax reform. Any one having any questions as to the desirability of taking this action, I believe, would profit from examination of this testimony. Consequently, I am placing it in the RECORD so that it may have the wider circulation that it deserves.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD, SR., AND ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD, JR., FLINT, MICH.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. Thank you very much.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. BYRNES. I want to join with you in welcoming General Summerfield here. We all remember his labors in the vineyard of Government, and they continue, really, in his interest in the welfare of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chamberlain?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Although Mr. Summerfield and his son are no longer constituents of mine, it was my privilege to represent the area of Flint, Mich., in the Congress for 8 years prior to our last redistricting and I became well acquainted with them both and want to join in welcoming them to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Griffiths?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I am happy, too, to welcome you, Mr. Summerfield, I wish, myself, that you were back down there delivering the mail. Things get worse every day.

The CHAIRMAN. It did move faster; didn't it, Mrs. Griffiths?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. It certainly did.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think we all agree to that.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of this committee, my name is Arthur Summerfield, Sr., and I have been an automobile and truck dealer for 42 years in the city of Flint, Mich. With me is my son, Arthur E. Summerfield, Jr., who has been a motor vehicle dealer and my partner for 25 years in Flint, and for the past 11 years in Gary, Ind.

We are here today representing ourselves, our employees—275 men and women—and our customers as witnesses to urge repeal of the 7-percent excise tax on new automobiles, retroactive to July 15, 1971, as proposed by Congressman Charles E. Chamberlain and Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michi-

gan, along with all other members of the Michigan delegation who joined in introducing H.R. 9816.

We are indeed grateful for the opportunity to appear before this committee and congratulate you, Chairman Mills, for the dispatch with which you called these hearings. We commend this committee for its efforts to provide measures to stimulate the economy, lower unemployment and stem the rising tide of inflation. Passage of H.R. 9816 would serve to help achieve all of these aims.

IMPORTANCE OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

The motor vehicle industry has long been regarded as a bellwether of the national economy—a drop in vehicle sales generally is the first indication of economic decline while renewed sales volume usually heralds the beginning of a recovery period.

The importance of the economic activity generated throughout the Nation by the manufacture of motor vehicles cannot be overemphasized. The motor vehicle manufacturing industry purchases goods and services from some 50,000 supplier firms and is the greatest single consumer of the products of other great industries such as steel, rubber, coal, iron, aluminum, and many others.

It is estimated that more than 13 million persons—holding one of every six jobs in the Nation—are employed in highway transport industries. Over 800,000 businesses are directly dependent on motor vehicle use for their continued existence.

ECONOMIC SITUATION IN JULY 1971

When H.R. 9816 was introduced 8 weeks ago, the economic situation facing our Nation gave cause for grave concern. Inflation was gathering momentum at a time of rising unemployment, balance-of-payments deficits, heavy overseas spending, and widespread discounting of our currency. The economy was faltering and consumer confidence remained low.

We could ill afford then—nor can we now—to have the motor vehicle industry, a prime creator of jobs and of spendable income, also falter.

Yet on July 7 unsold new 1971 automobiles in dealers' hands, domestic cars only, reached a record high of more than 1,800,000 cars in a declining market. Many dealers, already stretched financially, certainly were in no position to order and arrange payment for additional new cars.

The domestic vehicle industry was clearly reaching the very limit within which we could hope to maintain even the present level of production and unemployment in this country. Increased competition from abroad, coupled with mounting costs for labor, material, and mandatory safety and ecology requirements, presented an ominous set of circumstances, truly indicating a crisis in the automobile industry, and that cast serious doubt on the industry's ability to continue as an economic nucleus of this Nation.

THE THREAT TO JOBS FROM FOREIGN COMPETITION

The impact and problems of our present situation are beyond the control of the business community alone. During the past year, sales of cars from abroad rose to 14 percent of total U.S. sales and are now running about 16 percent for the first 6 months of 1971. In July, 18 percent of the total cars sold in this country and as of August 21, this very month, 21.98 percent of the automobiles sold to American customers were imported from other nations. On this basis of a 10-million-car year, this means 1,600,000 vehicles.

This percentage shows definite signs of increasing at an even faster rate, and without help from you the aggressive distribution plans of foreign car manufacturers could well cause them to actually dominate the American car market. Import sales are running 40 percent and more on the west coast of the

United States, and 20 percent on the east coast of the United States—and both German and Japanese companies are now greatly expanding their distribution in the greatest car market in the country—the great Middle West.

As dealers of domestic cars and trucks, we must compete against vehicles built in Japan where labor wage scales are reported to be one-quarter of the wage scales that exist in this country. We must also compete with vehicles built in West Germany where wages approximate half of the wages that are paid in this country. This, of course, results in unequal competition and is reflected in the automotive employment trend in each of the three countries.

For example, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, direct employment in the manufacture of motor vehicles in this country declined by 91,000 jobs last year. But in West Germany, jobs in the motor vehicle industry climbed from 560,000 in 1969 to 731,000 this year. Current Japanese employment figures are not available but it is noted that from 1960 to 1969 the number of jobs in Japan's transportation manufacturing rose from 514,000 to 754,000. We do not think that this Nation and its jobholders can stand to have this exporting of our jobs continue. The current high level of unemployment here is in no small part due to other American industries falling victim to the same circumstances as those faced by the automobile industry. This has resulted in nearly all of the goods, such as electronics and many other products, formerly produced here, now being manufactured by other nations and exported to us.

Dealers of domestic cars and our employees have been among the first to feel the thrust of this competitive disadvantage.

During 1970 and early 1971, approximately 850 domestic automobile outlets have been lost. An average dealer employs 25 persons and has an annual payroll of \$175,000 so this decline in dealerships has meant the loss of some 21,000 jobs and \$148 million in employee income.

You have already heard estimates on the favorable impact on new jobs from Secretary Connally resulting from the increased manufacture of more cars. To this should be added at the very least two employees per dealer or 56,000 new job opportunities.

For these reasons, we urge a favorable report from this committee and immediate enactment of legislation to eliminate the excise tax on new automobiles. This action is noninflationary. It will stimulate the economy and in particular it will generate jobs for our American citizens and workers.

BENEFITS FROM EXCISE TAX REMOVAL

The automobile excise tax was first enacted in 1917 and has remained with us almost continuously ever since as a so-called luxury tax and/or war measure. Other consumer durable goods such as radios, televisions, washers, refrigerators, et cetera, have been cleared of this outdated tax but, despite the welcome action for relief by this committee in 1965, it still remains to discriminate unjustly against every new car buyer in the average amount of \$200. Passage of this bill, retroactive to July 15, 1971, would return to purchasers of new vehicles since that time an average of \$200 in cash. We emphasize—the rebate would be to the car buyer, not to the automobile dealer, and not to the manufacturer, and it would not be inflationary.

Any question as to whether this tax saving will be passed on to new car buyers should be answered by the record. A Federal study ordered by President Johnson in 1965 after the tax on automobiles was reduced from 10 percent to 7 percent showed that the tax reduction was indeed passed on to the purchaser. The Bureau of Labor Statistics

also showed at that time a similar reduction in used car prices benefiting the consumer who generally needs economic help the most. I also understand that the presidents of the major domestic manufacturers have written to Congressman Chamberlain, and probably to many others, committing their companies to passing this tax reduction on.

As we view it, removal of this tax would have a twofold impact—it would help create and maintain new jobs through increased motor vehicle production and it would make available additional noninflationary funds for consumer use.

Repeal of this tax also would in some measure improve the competitive position of domestic car dealers despite the fact that imported products would share in the excise tax elimination. With our vehicles costing more to build, the tax is presently levied on a higher figure than it is for imports.

We feel that it is logical and safe to say that reduced prices on automobiles will have a lowering effect on the Consumer Price Index and that this will tend to reduce the pressure of the wage-price spiral.

REASON FOR REMOVAL OF EXCISE TAX ON LIGHT TRUCKS

At this time, we also would urge this committee to take action for the repeal of excise taxes on light duty trucks.

The popularity of these vehicles continues to grow annually primarily because of their use for personal transportation and for recreational purposes. A recent study shows that 18 percent of the Nation's households own one of more trucks with two-thirds of these used for nonbusiness reasons. For many families, particularly those in rural areas, these light duty trucks provide the sole means of transportation.

Here, again, lower production costs in other countries has led to the importation of more and more vehicles seeking to capture even this expanding market. The same arguments for tax relief made earlier for automobiles are equally applicable for light trucks.

SUMMARY

In summing up, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, we strongly feel that repeal of these automotive excise taxes in total would have the greatest all-around benefits of any single action to stimulate our economy. The effect on new job opportunities in vehicle manufacturing, auto dealerships and supplier industries, on creation of more favorable balance of payments, on reduction of trade deficits, on consumer price indexes, and on spendable income would extend to every corner of this Nation, and, in our opinion, would have no inflationary impact.

We stand ready as citizens and as businessmen to support this committee in any way we can to advance this program to restore the economic health of the Nation. We recognize that the responsibility of this committee and of Congress is indeed great, and we are confident, based on your record and experience, you will prove equal to the task of providing the leadership so urgently needed to help steer our Nation on a constructive and realistic course, a course designed to eliminate inflation, provide full employment, and restore confidence and stability in our economy both home and abroad.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. If my son or I can answer any questions, we will be very happy to try to accommodate you.

The CHAIRMAN. General, we appreciate having both of you with us, we especially appreciate the opportunity, General Summerfield, of meeting your son.

Mr. Burleson?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman.

I was very glad to note that you recom-

mend that light trucks ordinarily referred to as pickup trucks be included in the excise tax removal. Not to include them with passenger cars in the removal of the tax would be grossly discriminatory.

You mentioned recreational use of light trucks. Would you also propose that campers—the body built on the chassis, not a trailer—be included?

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. Yes, sir. In our own discussions we have had on it we felt that the inclusion of the pickup trucks up to and including the so-called ¾-ton pickup truck which comes to about a 7,500-pound gross vehicle weight would take in about 99 percent of the recreational vehicles and including the slide-in type of camper that slides into and onto a pickup body.

We, ourselves, have had no discussions on the excise tax on the body itself. I don't know, frankly, if they are paying an excise tax today like the vehicles are. I don't think that the recreational body itself which is a separate unit—I am not sure that they even pay a tax today.

The CHAIRMAN. They do not pay that tax. Just recently we made that change in that respect.

Mr. Betts?

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Summerfield, I have just one comment, more than anything else. Your presentation has been very helpful in several lights. I am thinking particularly of this question of passing the benefits of the tax back to the consumer. The other day when Mr. Nader was here, and I am not sure that you are acquainted with his testimony—

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. I have read it, sir.

Mr. BETTS. He was quite emphatic in trying to point out that benefits of the tax would never get back to the purchaser of the car. I think you have answered that pretty effectively. As I understand it, President Johnson initiated a study which pretty well nailed down the evidence that tax reduction actually gets back to the consumer; is that correct?

Mr. Nader made that rather emphatic statement. I think that is really one of the burdens you have to meet.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. Mr. Congressman, I, of course, read Mr. Nader's comments, as I have been reading many of his comments in the past. I, for one, first as a citizen and, second as an automobile dealer and as someone who is interested in this country resent very much people making irresponsible statements before this fine committee, this most important committee, that are not based upon fact, which impinges upon the integrity of the people engaged in the automobile industry. It is an honorable business. It is managed, operated, and participated in by honorable people. I don't know of anyone that is more interested in being constructive in trying to help this industry and this country at a time when facts should be known and actions taken, accordingly, than this industry. There is a full page ad of General Motors in which they specifically state, and if I may I will read, "who will receive the refund if the excise tax is repealed." If Congress follows the recommendations of the President, General Motors will pass along the full amount of this excise tax reduction to purchasers who took delivery of the new General Motors cars between August 15 and the date the tax is repealed. That is both the 1971 models and the 1972.

And a similar ad only in stronger terms was printed several days prior to this by the American Motors Co.

I can't conceive of any automobile dealer or any automobile manufacturer not recognizing the will of the Congress of the United States as well as the Presidency and not returning this amount.

There is nothing in the record to indicate we have ever done otherwise.

Mr. BETTS. I mentioned that, Mr. Summerfield, because I was sure you would want to answer it. I think it well that your answer is in the record.

Personally, I am on your side. I was a little amazed at the statements that Mr. Nader made. I think you have answered it very satisfactorily as far as I am concerned, and I want you to know that I appreciate it, too.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. Congressman Betts, I think it might be good since this thing was brought up by a previous witness to read into the record maybe not the whole thing because time is fleeting, but at least the title and date and initial paragraph to which our testimony referred.

November 29, 1965, released by the Office of the White House Press Secretary, memorandum to the President from Gardner Ackley, Council of Economic Advisers, on excise tax reduction 1966 model automobiles.

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics has completed its survey and prices of new model automobiles. It reports that manufacturers and retailers are fully passing on to the consumer the benefit of lower excise taxes and have reduced prices fractionally in addition to that. The BLS valuation makes allowance for quality changes."

(The full memorandum appears below:)

"[Office of the White House Press Secretary (Austin, Tex.), November 29, 1965]

"MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT FROM GARDNER ACKLEY, CHAIRMAN, COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, ON EXCISE TAX REDUCTION—1966 MODEL AUTOS

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics has completed its survey of prices of new-model automobiles. It reports that manufacturers and retailers are fully passing on to consumers the benefit of lower excise taxes and have reduced prices fractionally in addition. The BLS valuation makes allowance for quality changes.

"Earlier reports to you have covered the prices of other products subject to excise-tax reduction, including 1965-model cars. They showed that approximately 90 percent of last July's excise tax reduction was passed on to consumers.

"The study is being conducted by the BLS at the request of the Council of Economic Advisers and the Treasury Department. The full text of the BLS report is attached.

"REPORT FROM BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR ON PRICES OF 1966 MODELS OF AUTOMOBILES

"Manufacturers' introductory prices of 1966 models of new passenger automobiles averaged 0.7 percent lower than introductory prices of comparable 1965 models, after adjustments were made for changes in quality. This comparison represents prices in both years before addition of Federal excise taxes. Prices actually paid by dealers to manufacturers have been lowered further this year by the amount of the excise tax reduction (3 percentage points—from 10 to 7 percent) which became effective June 22, 1965. Thus, the full amount of the tax cut still is being passed on by the automobile manufacturers as a whole, and they have reduced prices fractionally, in addition. This action continues the moderate downward trend of new car prices at the manufacturers' level which has extended since 1959, when account is taken of improvements in the quality of new automobiles from year to year.

"Retail dealers' list prices of 1966 models of new passenger cars in October 1965 not only reflected the reduction in the Federal excise tax that became effective June 22 (about 2.1 percent on the retail price), but they showed a further decline of approximately 0.8 percent from prices of comparable 1965 models after adjustments were made for quality changes. Effective prices to consumer buyers were lowered correspondingly, since dealer concessions

from list prices were as large or larger than they had been on 1964 and 1965 models at the time of their introduction.

"Thus, new car dealers are continuing to pass on the full amount of the Federal excise tax reduction and, in addition, they are giving their customers the benefit of a fractional price reduction by manufacturers. The result is that retail prices of new cars continue to trend moderately downward, as they have since 1959, with allowance for quality improvements in new models from year to year."

NEW AUTOMOBILES

Make and model	1966 models priced for—	
	CPI	WPI
General Motors:		
Chevrolet Impala, 2-door sport coupe.....	X	X
Corvair Monza, 2-door sport coupe.....	X	X
Chevelle Malibu, 2-door sport coupe.....	X	X
Buick Le Sabre, 2-door sport coupe.....	X	X
Pontiac Catalina, 4-door sedan.....	X	X
Ford:		
Galaxie 500, 2-door hardtop.....	X	X
Fairlane 500, 4-door sedan.....	X	X
Falcon Futura, 4-door sedan.....	X	X
Mercury Monterey, 2-door hardtop.....	X	X
Mustang, 2-door hardtop.....	X	X
Chrysler:		
Plymouth Fury III, 4-door sedan.....	X	X
Plymouth Belvedere II, 4-door sedan.....	X	X
Plymouth Valiant 200, 4-door sedan.....	(1)	X
Dodge Polara, 4-door sedan.....	(2)	X
American Motors: Rambler Classic 770, 4-door sedan.....		
	X	X
Imports:		
English Ford Cortina deluxe, 2-door sedan.....	X	X
Renault Dauphine, 4-door sedan.....	X	X
Volkswagen, Model 113, 2-door sedan.....	X	X
Fiat 1100 D, 4-door sedan.....	(3)	X

¹ Priced as alternate to Rambler in a few cities.

² Priced as alternate to Plymouth in a few cities.

³ Priced as alternate to Volkswagen in a few cities.

I think it is also pertinent that the price index as put out by the Labor Department at that time also shows a corresponding decrease in used-car retail prices which had a very beneficial effect on the cost index that the country was looking at every month at that time.

In addition, this is an intensely competitive business in which dealers generally in the last 4 or 5 years have averaged about a 2-percent before tax profit on their sales and any dealer, manufacturer or combination that would somehow try to price himself \$200 a unit or any fraction of that over the competitive market would be out of business in a while of a hurry, in our personal opinion, anyway.

Mr. BETTS. Thank you very much.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS (presiding). Are there further questions?

Mr. GIBBONS?

Mr. GIBBONS. I know it is a very competitive business. I have a great respect for your business because one of my most beloved friends has been an automobile dealer all his life and I have cousins who are dealers.

What will happen to the used-car market? Are prices going down in the used car market?

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. Yes, sir. The first problem, if you want to call it that, is that we do have a problem in the retail end of the business. We have not made a lot of public comment or complaints about it like maybe some other people that are affected by the price freeze, but, naturally, this has already had a lowering effect on what we can sell a particularly late model used car for, and all of us are going to take a rather substantial loss on our current inventories, a one-time thing only. Here we have to make an assumption, for instance, that the price freeze stays on, sir. Then if the excise tax is removed, the invoice price on new cars will be lowered correspondingly \$200 a unit. Thus, of course, is bound to have the effect of impacting what the used cars will sell for in the market. This is what happened in 1965 and 1966.

So that it should have a beneficial effect for the used-car buyer as well as for the new-car buyer.

Mr. GIBBONS. All used-car prices will continue to come down and the dealer is going to absorb all that difference when you bring it in there? It is pretty hard in a business where the margin is only 2 percent.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. That is right, sir. We would undoubtedly have allowed less for particularly a late model used car. In the used car trade, in this business of course, there is as much attention paid to the condition of an individual car as to whether it is in identical make, model, color, or optional equipment. The profit picture again of the dealer industry in 1965, 1966, and 1967 showed a slight decrease in profits after 1965 rather than an increase. So we absorbed a good portion of it. It is a little hard to say because every car is different. That is not a cop-out. That is just the situation as to what we would be allowing.

Mr. GIBBONS. I don't want to argue with you, but I want to tell you an example that happened to me. I pride myself in trying to buy cars pretty reasonably. So I usually know what I want and usually have to have a car that is ordered in the factory because I do a lot of traveling in my business. I have compared prices in the Washington area with the same trade-in. I ordered a Chevrolet station wagon right out of the book and there is a \$600 difference in the price that I got. It seems to me that the only place that the dealer made the change was either in the amount of profit that he was giving up to me, for which I would be very grateful, or he was making a vast change in the value of my trade-in.

I did all this shopping in one day and took the lowest one and saved \$600. So that it just seems to me that what you are going to do is if the prices don't go up is really take a bath in the used car market. Am I right?

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. May I answer this way: The dealer who apparently tried to lower the price of the used car allowance as far as he did didn't get the business. You gave the business to someone else.

Mr. GIBBONS. He is still in business and has been in business for a long time in the Washington area.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. He would have to compete more closely than he or he couldn't stay in. The point is that he didn't get the business.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I particularly enjoyed hearing you, and I think you brought real facts. I bitterly regret that I was not present when Mr. Nader testified. I would be very interested if he would turn his powers upon the effect of his statements on the gain for some cars and particularly since I believe he has never said anything concerning Toyota. What is the effect of the gain for Toyota in his attack upon American cars and European cars? I think that would be quite interesting to know what the effect is. If he is not actually in the pay of some other companies, I think he should be asked to answer those questions.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. I couldn't agree with you more, Congressman. I have spent a good many years of my life in this city and before the various committees. It distresses me greatly to see such witnesses as you have just mentioned appear before these congressional committees and usually with television exposure where he makes these unfounded charges that are presenting a false image to the American people of the industries of this country. They go mostly unchallenged and the harm that has been done is beyond calculation to the confidence of the people of this country and others in the industries of this Nation as well as the people who own them. I hasten to say, too, that many people have the image that, for instance, the automobile industry is a big faceless giant as a result of such comments

as he has made when in reality these corporations are people, they are owned by millions of individual stockholders including a large percentage of the employees themselves.

It is too easy to identify a big corporation as a certain machine when in reality it is all of us and when you permit that to continue to expand and make a Roman holiday atmosphere before congressional committees with a whole nation listening, the destructive results of that kind of exhibitionism is beyond calculation, and I am so grateful to you for calling attention to it.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I can't understand the foundation of it. Who makes the inquiries? Who produces the facts? How does he pay them? Where is he getting paid if he is not being paid by another manufacturer to make the attack? I don't really understand it, and I don't think you have to have even an engineer to point out to you the unsafety of a foreign-made car on an American road.

There is a woman in this Congress whose nephew was killed in a foreign-made car not because the car did anything but a truck passed him and the suction from the truck knocked him off the road. Unfortunately it didn't kill him instantly; they ran up thousands of dollars in bills before he died before ever coming out of a coma. But anybody ought to be able to make a little resume of how many people in a foreign-made car involved in an accident have survived the accident and, believe me, I would say it is very, very few, particularly on a major highway.

Why doesn't he examine this? I don't understand the whole system.

Would you like to ask a question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, Madam Chairman, I would.

I regret that we are having a quorum call because I had several questions I wanted to have answered. However, Mr. Summerfield, I would say that you have made an eloquent statement. Having sponsored legislation for many years to repeal the automobile excise tax I have reviewed the arguments for such action from time to time but never have I found a more complete and reasoned statement than you have presented.

The first question that I had was regarding the pass-through to the consumer and Mr. Betts has raised that question and it has been adequately answered. I have discussed the repeal of this tax with many people recently. I have heard the argument, "Why do we repeal this excise tax on automobiles? The automobile industry has just reported that profits in the automobile industry are high, and that they have done very well during the first 6 months of this year."

Do you have any answer for that, Mr. Summerfield?

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. Yes; a very simple answer, Congressman. I stated a moment ago in my prepared statement that we had in the hands of dealers 1,800,000 automobiles. Those cars had been sold to the dealers not to the public. The corporation statements for the first 6 months, of course, reflected the profits that they made on the 1,800,000 automobiles that we had unsold in our hands of which we still have upward of 1 million automobiles of 1971 models on our hands, something close to 1.5 million on our hands. So that the statements of the automobile manufacturers released as of that time as they were do not reflect the situation insofar as the cars never having been sold to the public but have been recognized in their statements.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. Today, Congressman, according to Automotive News, the industry is going to build its 6 millionth car of the year and it is also estimated that the domestic car inventory is roughly 1.5 million so that, therefore, 1 out of 4 is yet unsold; This, of course, is one of the reasons for our feeling of alarm, that the apparent on-the-surface economic health of the automobile manufac-

turers as reported for the first 6 months is quite misleading.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. But you are telling us that even though these vehicles are unsold, the manufacturer has, in fact, been paid for this car.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. He has his profit.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And you have to get yours.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. This leads, Mr. Summerfield, to my next question. That was with reference to the current sales position. We are told that it appears to be good and recent reports say that sales are up. Maybe this is because of the recommendation of repeal by the President. I would hope that that has had a salutary effect on sales, but with sales being up why is there a need for this? Why shouldn't we just rock along as we are because we need the revenue? What is the urgency, in your judgment, for repealing this tax? How do you answer that?

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Jr. The sales prior to President Nixon's message were not as healthy as they are now. In our own personal experience in the two agencies there was a very dead spot for 5 or 6 days because of the shock and the confusion in the marketplace so far as the excise taxes going to be rebated and so on. Roughly, on the 21st or 22d of August, at least in our two places, and as later reported in Automobile News, business did improve because of the statements that excise tax on cars purchased in this period would be rebated and there was, of course, a feeling that cars were a better bargain. At the same time, even the present rate of sales is not going to stimulate the economy or take care of this big inventory. There is going to have to be an additional rate of sales.

In the meantime, this import penetration rose to 18 percent in the month of July and 21.98, almost 22 percent in the month of August, so that all is not well.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Summerfield, we are running out of time because of the quorum call, and I must conclude. I want to join Mrs. Griffiths in commending you particularly for addressing yourselves to the problem of the foreign import. I, myself, feel that this is a problem that we have neglected for much too long.

Do you have any further comments than those embodied in your statement that you wanted to pass on to the committee about the threat of foreign imports to the U.S. market?

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. Yes, I have. I like to tell it as it is. We have already seen in the last few years what has happened in, for instance, the television industry for the reason that we did not meet head on to the problem of the competition from overseas. So that today practically all television sets that we have in our homes or places of business, most of them, in most part, are manufactured in Japan and assembled over here in this country, and sold to the American people.

You can take industry after industry where that has happened and what is developing here, if I may say, is that we are getting into a situation economically that can have rather dire results in the future if we continue to permit this to happen. We can no longer afford to export jobs in the automobile industry, or the television industry, or the radio industry, not to mention any of the other industries of this country.

What has happened to the steel production in this country, and I can go on and on.

We who have lived quite a long time remember some of the things that have happened in years past when we have allowed ourselves to be in a position where foreign competition got so keen that the basic fabric

of this Nation and our whole economy was in danger and what happened? I don't want to use the word. But I do not want to see foreign nations accomplish their objectives of making, for instance, Japan, for instance, the No. 1 industrial country in this world at the expense of America.

As far as the automobile industry is concerned, it was born here. It was conceived here. It was developed by the genius of American workmen. We built the industry for the whole world, and to sit cautiously by and not recognize some of the things that we may well have to seriously consider in the months immediately ahead of us, I think, would be a serious mistake.

We know what is happening in Europe today. And who rebuilt those nations? The American taxpayers to the extent of probably to upward of \$140 billion.

Now, they will use the very devices and engineering genius and material and financial help that this country gave them to destroy the very substance of this Nation. I think the people of this country better wake up to what is happening.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I share your view, Mr. Summerfield, and commend you again for your statement.

Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Thank you very much for being here.

This committee will recess until 2 o'clock. Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. Madam Chairman, are we supposed to return at 2 o'clock?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. No.

Mr. SUMMERFIELD, Sr. Thank you very much indeed.

(Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 2 p.m., the same day.)

AIR FORCE CHIEF OF STAFF ADDRESS

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to join with members of the Air Force Association last Wednesday, in a luncheon honoring the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. John D. Ryan. AFA claiming a membership of over 100,000 was celebrating its 25th anniversary. General Ryan's remarks are particularly noteworthy during these troubled times. It is important that we do not fail our obligations to preserve and protect our great country. I am confident his comments will be found most convincing:

REMARKS BY GEN. JOHN D. RYAN

I always enjoy these Air Force Association luncheons because they give me the opportunity to exchange thoughts with many of the people who help the Air Force do its job.

I have especially looked forward to this 1971 convention. As the Air Force Association Silver Anniversary Year draws to a close, the Air Force itself begins its 25th year of existence as a co-equal with its sister services. We have both come a long way.

Over the past quarter century, the Air Force Association has measured up to the tasks it set out to accomplish. Its support of aerospace power has been effective and unflagging. I know I speak for all in the United States Air Force when I express appreciation for everything the Air Force Association has done, and is doing, for us.

During these past twenty-five years, in the process of accurately portraying aerospace

capabilities and doctrine, the Air Force Association has consistently shown a comprehensive understanding and awareness of the overall defense needs and problems of the United States.

If ever such an awareness were needed in this country, it is now. As the world has grown more complex, as America in general and the American military in particular have been indelibly marked by the war in Southeast Asia, and as we have begun to put together the forces and plans needed to support a strategy of Realistic Deterrence, there have arisen many differing points of view about what is happening now and what actions we can and should take.

One point of view sees this as a time when the United States is completely withdrawing from the world; another views the U. S. as solidly encamped around the world like Roman Legions.

One view holds that the strategic forces of both the United States and the Soviet Union are already capable of so much destruction that there is no point in spending any more money in this area; another suggests that we can maintain a strategic deterrent with fewer than our three current strategic forces.

Finally, because of pressing internal needs, one view sees current military spending as outrageously high in relation to domestic spending; another because of inflation, observes that current military budgets are low in relation to past defense spending.

There is always a potential hazard when views are presented without relationship to the total problem. These views are especially dangerous, in my judgment, because they are often put forth as guides to national security with such sincerity and good intentions that they gain a credibility which they may not deserve.

I have zeroed in on defense spending, strategic forces, and military basing for good reasons. First, there currently seems to be more discussion and more confusion about these areas than about any other.

Second, American security and the security of our allies directly depends on what happens in these areas.

Most of you are well-informed about defense and military matters in this country. You have got to be to do your job. As a result, you spend a good part of your time reading defense related articles and reports. And you are subjected to quite a few speeches on the topic. Many of you retaliate by making a few speeches yourselves.

How often in the past few years have you heard someone say that current defense spending is such and such a percent of the total federal budget; that we are now spending so many more (or less) billion dollars on defense than on domestic programs?

Or: Because of inflation, the dollars in this year's DoD budget are, in terms of buying power, lower than any budget since FY 62 or 54 or whenever?

There is nothing inaccurate about such statements. They are legitimate ways of describing defense spending. But that is the point. They are *descriptions* of this country's defense budget, not *prescriptions* for what we spend on defense.

There is no sacrosanct relation that defense spending must keep from year to year with previous budgets or with domestic spending. The long pole in the defense tent is our potential adversaries capabilities.

People must understand that the requests for funds first submitted by each of the services and then combined into the overall defense budget are based on the threat coupled with our defense policies for defending against the threat. Right now that threat is greater than any ever faced by the United States.

Our defense spending should be based on what we need to deter potential aggressor

capabilities from being used against us to overcome them if they are.

Granted, as a result of SALT or for some other reasons, the threat could be reduced and there could be a cutback in potential enemy forces. If so, we could make the necessary adjustments.

And, if such a situation does occur, the request for military spending will be determined, as it is now, by what we need to counter the threat to this country. Very likely in the near and long term future the number one priority for the American military will continue to be the deterrence of strategic nuclear war.

Under the present circumstances, with increasing costs and other inflationary trends and numerous domestic programs crying for support, many in the nation are in a mood to listen to anyone who has a proposal to reduce defense spending. One proposal often heard is that we don't need land-based missiles, sea-based missiles, and manned bombers. Since the issue concerns nothing less than our future national security, let's be somewhat discriminating before we take our savings—if any—and run.

The United States fundamental philosophy and strategy is to deter war. Our forces and policies are designed to keep war from happening by making the cost of war to an aggressor greater than his possible gains. The deterring effect of our forces must work regardless of the number of uncertainties which might exist in a crisis. Some examples of the uncertainties we face in structuring our strategic forces are:

The future capabilities of hostile nations and their intentions;

The ways a war could begin;

The performance of our weapons in combat; and

The tasks we may be asked to perform.

Because of these and other uncertainties, the United States relies on a mixed force of manned bombers, land and sea-based missiles known as the strategic Triad.

Each system has unique strong points which provide mutual support against either technological or military surprise. Technologically, the survival of bombers and the alert submarine force is insensitive to missile CEPs; therefore, bombers and the alert submarine force provide assurance against a crippling first-strike against our land-based missiles in case of a breakthrough in missile CEPs.

Bombers and land-based missiles being insensitive to anti-submarine warfare provide assurance against a breakthrough in anti-submarine warfare. Bomber survival however is dependent on adequate time between warning of an incoming missile and safe escape from its airfield. Thus, sea-based missiles and land-based missiles provide assurance against a breakthrough in negating our warning system.

Militarily—the Triad compounds and complicates enemy offensive and defensive problems and provides enough flexibility to respond to nuclear war or provocation below a general nuclear exchange. Offensively, an aggressor's attempt to destroy all elements of the Triad at the same time would fail because even the best possible attack would provide considerable warning to at least two elements and allow a substantial force to retaliate.

Defensively—a mix of bombers and missiles tasks enemy defenses to defend against both. Thus, a mix of forces on our part makes an enemy spend considerably more to get a certain level of defense. To put it another way, for a given enemy expenditure on defense, the U.S. does not need as many forces to do the job as we would if our forces were either all bombers or all missiles.

Because of the global nature of our economic and political interests, the deterrence requirement is not so narrow that a U.S. homeland defense strategy alone is sufficient. Deterrence of attacks on our allies, as well as on U.S. deployed strategic and general

purpose forces, requires appropriate and credible responses. Within the Triad, any prospective aggressor will see that our forces include both protection against surprise attack and a capability to fight at many levels of war. For the foreseeable future, the Triad will provide the U.S. with a credible strategic deterrent, provided we maintain the viability of each leg.

In a period of near strategic parity and accelerated technological momentum on the part of the Soviets, the virtues of the Triad become even more important. It is the synergistic effect of all three elements of the Triad which adds assurance against the kinds of uncertainties we face in structuring our strategic forces. Assurance after all is really the name of the strategic game, now more than ever before.

As part of our determination to deter conflict at lower levels, or if such conflict does occur, to insure it does not escalate to strategic nuclear war, the United States currently stations air, ground and naval units at bases around the world.

Wherever it is in our national interest to deter war—whether accomplished by land, sea, or air forces—there will be a requirement for a system of main operating bases outside the CONUS. Any limitations of this requirement affect all our military forces. Naturally, my direct concern is with air bases.

I know some people suggest that political constraints during a crisis will not allow the Air Force to use bases in an increasing number of nations. Again this challenge must be considered in light of the total picture.

The technical argument is that base rights will not be granted. But it must be obvious that any nation desiring the assistance of the United States will make bases available.

Our overseas bases fall into two categories: Those with forces present 24 hours a day, every day of the year and those which serve as a resupply and staging location to allow the units it supports to operate elsewhere. Our allies who daily face potential aggression from large, neighboring forces, such as in Europe or Korea, are especially sensitive to this difference. Consequently, in some areas of the world, where our interest is vital, in-place forces are required as tangible evidence of the depth of our commitment.

I want to point out that this strategy has worked. When in the face of serious external aggression to our allies we have made firm commitments and have underwritten these commitments by garrisoning ground and air units in the sovereignty of our ally, there has been no aggression. NATO and post-1953 Korea are cases in point.

In other areas the assurance of our assistance is enough to deter aggression and we rely on our world-wide mobility capability as proof that we can, in fact, provide assistance quickly when necessary.

The Air Force is enhancing its world-wide employment capability. For example, we have demonstrated our bare base capability and can adapt it to a wide range of circumstances.

Ultimately, the location of our forces is determined by the location, type, and magnitude of the threat we must counter to successfully deter war.

I've talked about defense spending, strategic force mix and military basing and I keep ending up on the same note: the threat. Typical military thinking, you say. You bet it is.

Determination of how much we request, what kinds of forces we need, and where those forces are located has got to be based on the threat. This will remain as fundamental to our defense planning in the future as it has been in the past.

I have welcomed the opportunity to share my thoughts with you and look forward to visiting with many of you during the remainder of the conference.

H. R. GROSS, THE CONSCIENCE OF
UNCLE SUCKER

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the August edition of the Washington Monthly magazine contains an article about our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, the Honorable H. R. Gross. The article, written by Mr. Jacques Leslie, captures the spirit and character of H. R., as we all affectionately like to refer to him, about as well as anything that has ever been written or said about him. I would only hope that it might be included in any literature or pamphlets that might be received on a regular basis by the political science departments of colleges and universities across the country.

I am reminded of a quotation from the great Patrick Henry which, despite the long span of years since it was spoken, applies perfectly to the gentleman from Iowa:

Standing true: It is human to stand with the crowd; it is divine to stand alone. It is manlike to follow the people, to drift with the tide; it is God-like to follow a principle, to stem the tide. It is natural to compromise conscience, and follow the social fashion for the sake of gain or pleasure; it is divine to sacrifice both on the altar of truth and duty.

I salute my friend from Iowa—I am proud to serve in the Congress with him and wish him many more years of dedicated service to his district, and more importantly, to the country.

I insert the article from Washington Monthly in the RECORD at this point:

H. R. GROSS: THE CONSCIENCE OF
UNCLE SUCKER

(By Jacques Leslie)

Long before the word was fashionable in left-wing circles, Harold Royce (H. R.) Gross, Republican congressman from Iowa's Third District, was preaching impending Apocalypse like a backwoods circuit rider. Now that one disaster after another is befalling the nation, Gross' vision no longer seems far-fetched. His consequent dilemma is comparable to that of a doctor who would like to heal but has a certain vested interest in illness nevertheless. Gross is in favor of averting doom, to be sure, but if it does come, he'll have the satisfaction of a prophet whose predictions finally have come true. There are worse ways to end a career.

Apocalyptic feelings are not the only thing Gross has in common with his left-wing counterparts. Like them, he has frequently inveighed against wasteful federal spending and the frightening power of the federal bureaucracy. He refers to the Pentagon as "Fort Fumble" and has words of praise for A. Ernest Fitzgerald, who exposed the \$2-billion cost overrun on the C-5A. But Gross is anything but a liberal. He has built his reputation on a combination of uncompromising integrity, sophisticated understanding of House parliamentary procedure, a rough-hewn, ridiculing sense of humor, and an unquestioning belief in the wisdom of a balanced budget.

Called by some "the watchdog of the federal treasury" and by others "the abominable no-man of the House," Gross cultivates the idea that he is a principled loner, an excep-

tion among men who have taken to heart Sam Rayburn's maxim, "To get along, go along." In the 91st Congress for example, Gross voted against President Nixon more often than all congressmen serving a full two-year term, opposing him on 58 per cent of all roll-call votes. (The average House member opposed the President 29 per cent of the time.) To Gross, ineffectiveness is practically evidence of virtue: "I don't care in committee or on the floor of the House whether I'm the sole vote. If I'm firmly convinced that a bill is bad, or enough of it is bad to overbalance whatever good may be in it, why I'll vote against it," Gross says. "You lose these fights. While you enjoy winning, it doesn't bother me to be in the minority as I have been a great many times."

Among the programs Gross has unsuccessfully opposed are foreign aid, the Peace Corps, all salary increases for congressmen from the time they received \$12,500 a year (they now get \$42,500), most congressional junkets, and the United Nations. When Gross loses, he occasionally resorts to sarcasm. A few days after President John F. Kennedy's death, when House members were considering a bill to pay for burial expenses, Gross rose on the floor to ask if the cost of the eternal flame at Arlington was included in the bill. When a bill to reimburse New York City for its expenses during Khrushchev's 1960 visit to the UN passed, Gross said on the floor, "I swear I think that what we ought to do is pass a bill, if that is necessary, to remove the torch from the hand of the Statue of Liberty and insert in lieu thereof a cup—a tin cup."

GOTHIC RADICAL

The front room of Gross' office gives fair warning of what lies within. One sign on the wall says "Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody." Another says, "There is always free cheese in a mousetrap." And another, "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.—Thomas Jefferson." The last quotation is particularly apt, for, like Jefferson, Gross is a Francophile and an Anglophobe, and believes farmers are extraordinarily virtuous. He appears to have burrowed deeply into anti-establishment individualism—down through George Wallace and the racist flag-wavers, past Jerry Rubin and the underground left, around by tunnels occupied by Thoreau, Calhoun, and small farmers, and back through Andy Jackson to Jefferson. An example of his attitude towards France appears in his newsletter in a eulogy of Charles De Gaulle. Gross writes, "He was a nationalist and he put what he conceived to be the best interest of France above all other considerations. Would that we could find a President of the United States who would do as much!" Gross finishes his article by saying, "His coffin, made of rough oak timber, cost \$63."

Looking like an American Gothic in glasses, Gross is a slight man with a booming voice. Born on a farm in Arispe, Iowa, in 1899, he never finished high school. After serving in the Army first under General John J. Pershing at the Mexican border and then in France in World War I, he studied at the University of Missouri School of Journalism but did not receive a degree. For the next 15 years he worked as a reporter and editor for various Iowa newspapers, then put his voice to use as a newscaster for radio station WHO in Des Moines. Known as "the fastest tongue in radio," Gross could speak 200 words a minute in a clear, solid tone. The man who introduced the future congressman and did his commercials was Ronald Reagan.

Gross first ran unsuccessfully in the Republican primary for governor in 1940, then in 1948 was elected to Congress from Iowa's Third District, which has not been repre-

sented by a Democrat since 1934. Gross' only close call came in 1964, when the Johnson landslide swept out all other Iowa Republican congressmen. Gross won that election by 419 votes. In 1968 he considered running for the Senate against Harold Hughes, but says he decided against it because of his advancing age (he is now 72).

Some observers think of Gross as an unmitigated clown, a "Callban" who "has exploited and profited from every rigid prejudice in the State of Iowa" and "has an invincible incapacity for growth." A look at the newsletter he sends out weekly to 9,000 Iowa subscribers does not entirely dispel that notion. In it, the United States is referred to as "Uncle Sap," "Uncle Sucker," "Uncle Sugar," and "Uncle Handout"; *The Washington Post* is a "far-out left-wing newspaper"; credit cards are known as "plastic money"; and Martin Luther King "can foment trouble with the same facility that he advocates 'peace.'" He relates jokes about the Office of Economic Opportunity and hippies and, after mentioning a news account about President Johnson tossing beer cans out of his car as he sped around his Texas ranch, suggests that "Home on the Range" be changed to "Foam on the Range."

On occasion, Gross uses ridicule to make his colleagues squirm because they spend money so freely. When, for instance, Rep. Frank Thompson's bill to establish the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was brought to the floor for passage, Gross introduced an amendment to make sure that the Foundation would provide for belly dancing. He specified that he meant: "the irregular jactitations and/or rhythmic contraction and coordinated relaxations of the serrati, obliques, and abdominis recti group of muscles—accompanied by rotatory undulations, tilts, and turns timed with and attuned to the titillating and blended tones of synchronous woodwinds." Gross later admitted to the chamber that he had received technical assistance in drafting his amendment from Rep. Durward G. Hall, the only protologist in Congress.

Not all of Congressman Gross' legislative humor demonstrates a light touch, however. When the House was considering a bill to control and exterminate rats, Gross asked on the floor, "It would be interesting to know how many children are bitten by squirrels that they feed and try to handle. On the basis of that, does anyone suggest a program to exterminate squirrels?" Partially as a result of Gross' opposition, the bill was scuttled.

Gross is in turn the frequent object of barbs from other congressmen. Observing that Gross has not left the United States since he fought in France in World War I and is opposed to congressional junkets, Reps. John Ashbrook and Frank Thompson sponsored a resolution last year to create a committee consisting only of Gross with the task of inspecting U.S. economic and military aid expenditures throughout the world. The committee was to be called the "H. R. Gross Special Congressional Investigating Committee."

Junketing congressmen often send Gross postcards from the countries they visit. "Paris is great! Wish you were here!" a typical card says. Rep. Morris Udall says he sent Gross a letter asking him to join a junket, and added, "Rome is ready for you." Udall says Gross wrote back saying, "The damn trouble is that I'm not ready for Rome."

Even President Johnson has joined in the needling. After giving his last State of the Union speech before a joint session of Congress on January 15, 1969, Johnson told reporters that he had seen tears in Lady Bird's eyes during the speech, and afterwards asked her why. Mrs. Johnson, who was sitting in the House gallery with her 19-month-old grandchild, Patrick Lyndon Nugent, said the

child had been waving his bottle around, causing her to fear that "it would slip and hit H. R. Gross right on top of the head." President Johnson added, "I guess she felt that every Congress should have one H. R. Gross. I guess she wanted to preserve him."

THE TECHNIQUES OF OBSTRUCTION

Yet for all the kidding Gross receives, he is praised by a large number of congressmen on both sides of the aisle. Of 17 congressmen asked their opinion of him, only one failed to indicate respect for his efforts. For example, Rep. Silvio Conte, whose political persuasions are far to the left of Gross', says, "I think he performs a hell of a great service for the Congress." The conventional wisdom among representatives is that it is important to have one person like Gross in each Congress, but that if the House were filled with Grosses, it would be unworkable. He introduces relatively few bills each session and does not play a particularly active role in the shaping of legislation in committee. Instead, his function is essentially negative. Whereas most members pay detailed attention to bills within their committees, Gross is the only congressman who makes a concerted effort to read the entire contents of every bill, regardless of committee or calendar, that reaches the House floor. This is no mean feat, since in the 91st Congress, for example, 2,951 bills, many of them several hundred pages long, were reported to the floor.

Gross is constantly on the lookout for wasteful appropriations, self-serving arrangements among members, or ambiguous legislation. When he is unclear about some bill, he asks a question, and the response about the legislation's intent is then a matter of record. If the answer does not satisfy him, he may turn to his array of procedural gimmicks to delay or prevent the bill's passage, to ensure that other members know what they are voting on, or to get a record vote. He is generally well prepared, he is a good debater and expert parliamentarian, and his questions are germane. Because congressmen generally have a well-developed fear of embarrassment on the House floor, the knowledge that Gross is perennially there ready to challenge them has stimulated many to be well prepared themselves.

The most famous of Gross' techniques is the quorum call. He believes that all congressmen's first responsibility is to be on the floor when the House is in session, and therefore has no qualms about calling a quorum at any time. Though no statistics have ever been compiled on the subject, it is possible that the congressman from Iowa has called more quorum calls than any congressman since the founding of the Republic. During one six-month period, from January to June 1962, Gross called more than half of the 60 quorum calls put on in the House. Now, because a few other congressmen, notably Reps. Hall, Ashbrook, and William Scherle, have taken up his cause, Gross asks for relatively few quorum calls. Several years ago, Hall called a quorum simply to honor Gross' birthday. On another occasion, Rep. Tom Rees, angered by two quorum calls (one by Gross) which had been called during a meeting of the liberal Democratic Study Group the day before, made a speech on the House floor against "capricious and senseless use of quorum calls which have little or no relationship to the important matters which this Congress has at hand. As soon as Rees finished his speech, Gross made a point of order that a quorum was not present.

Because it takes half an hour to read through the list of House members, the quorum call can be used to delay action on a bill. Gross defends his use of it, saying, "How else can you make a point? Suppose you get up and you're pushed around by the Speaker or whoever is presiding. This is one

way of letting them know that you don't like it. . . . The point is that I think they [other congressmen] ought to be on the House floor. I don't know whether they're in their offices or playing golf or in the gymnasium or in the swimming pool. . . . I'm using the quorum call just as they use it, and if they're on the floor, I can't get a quorum call."

Other congressmen disagree. They believe they can spend much of their time more productively in their offices than on the floor and say that Gross can afford to spend so much time there only because he does not take an active part in the writing and shaping of legislation. "I'd like to know where I'd be if I spent as much time on the floor as he does," says Rep. Udall. "If you insisted that all 435 members be there all the time, it would be an incredible waste of time."

Another of Gross' techniques is the objection to unanimous consent requests. The House handles much of its business, particularly scheduling, private bills, and assorted matters of secondary interest, through unanimous consent. When it is used, the objection of one member is enough to defeat a motion. Congressman Gross employs this technique to combat the "Tuesday-Thursday Club," comprised of congressmen who arrange to have unimportant business scheduled on Friday and Monday so that they can go home four days at a stretch. Gross has frequently used unanimous consent objections to block long weekend recesses or the scheduling of unimportant bills on Friday, thereby transforming the Tuesday-Thursday Club into the Tuesday-Friday Club. Asked if Gross had ever put a monkey wrench in his plans, Carl Albert, now the Speaker of the House, said, "There have been so many times, I can't recall."

Another dilatory procedure is the motion to "strike the enacting clause." This can be used only when all time for discussion of an amendment has expired. By moving to "strike the enacting clause," a congressman gets five more minutes of debate time, followed by a vote whether or not to kill the bill. Because this motion must be made in writing, Gross always carries copies of it in his pocket.

To some extent Congressman Gross benefits from the mystification that surrounds House parliamentary procedure. House procedure is codified in four sources: the Constitution, the House rules, Thomas Jefferson's *Manual*, and the 11 volumes of precedents of the Speakers and Chairmen of the Committees of the Whole. Gross has made himself an expert on House procedure and advises new members that the first thing they should do is learn the rules. "I can see some congressmen who've been here for several terms who don't even know the working rules of the House. . . . Some of them are pitiful, some of them never engage in debate, never get into any issues. That's their business, but nobody can tell me that the country wouldn't be better served if more of them were staying on the floor of the House and knew what the hell was going on."

Rep. Udall, who ran unsuccessfully for House Majority Leader in January and has co-authored a book called *The Job of a Congressman*, believes Gross over-emphasizes the importance of the rules. "It's a myth that the rules are so tough and complicated. The gimmicks Gross uses you could teach a guy in a week or two."

Because of Gross' willingness to use all the parliamentary procedures at his disposal, he is something of an alien power to the leadership of both parties. One congressman cites House Minority Leader Gerald Ford as saying, "There are three parties in the House—Democrats, Republicans, and H. R. Gross." Many committee chairmen try to iron out possible differences with Gross by notifying him of their intentions in advance. Some congressmen report that they

have changed legislation in committee to anticipate Gross' objections on the floor. Thus, though Gross rarely has the votes to back up his convictions, he does have a negative influence, a veto power, over some aspects of legislation.

THE GADFLY AS FREAK

The basic article of Gross' faith is summed up in his bill, H.R. 144 (a gross equals 12 dozen), which he has introduced annually for more than a decade. The bill is invariably assigned to the Ways and Means Committee and never heard from again. It calls for, essentially, a balanced budget and the gradual retirement of the national debt. Deficit spending is not only responsible for the nation's present economic difficulties, Gross says, but also, "We're plastering the generations to come with mortgages that will never be paid off. We're putting them under an unbelievable handicap. And all this is having its effect on the moral fiber of the country. . . . The main reason why we will go into a crisis will be financial. At least that will be the spring board."

Gross is aware that his view of deficit spending is a distinctly minority one. "All you have to do," he says, "is get up and ask them [other congressmen] when they're going to give consideration to paying on the federal debt, and they look down their noses or smile at you as though you're some sort of a freak standing down in the well of the House. I can see it. My vision isn't getting any better with age but I can see them around on the floor. 'What the hell, you must be nuts!'"

Estimates of what Rep. Gross has "saved" American taxpayers range from millions to billions of dollars, but not everyone agrees that the amount saved always justifies the scuttling of the programs. Certainly some of Gross' proposed economies are reasonable. One example is a bill he has introduced this year to prohibit junkets by lame-duck congressmen. In the past such trips have been authorized as a kind of farewell present to non-returning congressmen.

But Gross is opposed not only to lame-duck junkets, but the great majority of other junkets as well. When asked if he thought any junkets might have an educational value worth their expense, Gross said, "Oh, some, of them might, but all too many of them are in the nature of pleasure trips." While that statement is probably true, many congressmen believe Gross' efforts in preventing junkets are a bit overzealous and a perfect reflection of his own provincialism.

Nevertheless, some of Gross' objections to junkets seem unquestionably justified. In July, 1969, Gross blocked a unanimous consent request to skip a House session on the day of the Apollo 11 launching so that Congressmen could accept free government transportation to Cape Kennedy to observe the moonshot. Gross said he was "unable to find any reason at all why a substantial amount of money should be spent" to transport the congressmen and their families to Florida. Because of his objection, the House was forced to meet on the day of the launching anyway.

Among the projects Gross has opposed are the Rayburn House Office Building, Robert F. Kennedy Stadium, and the D.C. Aquarium. He voted against a bill to appropriate \$76,000 to outgoing Speaker John McCormack for office space; he blocked House passage of a bill authorizing a \$500,000 study of the proposals for the United States to convert to the metric system; he blocked a \$1,500 expense allowance for the congressional physician. Some charge that Gross is concerned only with trivial appropriations, while ignoring the huge sums meted out annually to agencies like the Department of Defense. Last year Gross voted against the appropriation bills for the Departments of Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Interior,

Justice, Labor, Post Office, State, Transportation, Treasury, and Health, Education and Welfare; he voted against appropriations for the Office of Education, foreign aid, independent offices, the Madison Building of the Library of Congress, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and the Smithsonian Institution. But he did vote in favor of the largest appropriation bill of all, \$66.6 billion for the Department of Defense, because "in this business I would prefer to make an error on the side of what I conceive to be national security, the ability to retaliate, the ability to live in a nuclear holocaust." Gross says he believes some of the \$66.6 billion is spent wastefully, but because so much necessary information is classified, "unless you're a member of the House Armed Services Committee, how in the hell can you know whether it's justified or not?"

Gross hopes the numerous examples of wasteful spending he has found will have a symbolic effect on the public. "It's a hell of a lot clearer picture when you're dealing with \$850,000 than with \$70 billion when you can't get a handle on it." But once armed with the knowledge that the government is wasteful, what is the public supposed to do? Gross doesn't know. "All we can do is try to hold members of Congress to account for the results obtained from the expenditure of [for example] \$70 billion [on defense]. Eventually it shows up in one way or another. It may be a hell of a long time, and those who are the most responsible may be beyond the reach of the public, but there's no easy answer to this."

GURLING IN THE WASTELAND

If Gross is not a sophisticated political theorist, then he is a dedicated moralist who has joined in attacks on Abe Fortas, Adam Clayton Powell, and Bobby Baker. As a result of his accusation that Max Kampelman, a Johnson appointee to the post of chairman of the District of Columbia City Council, was involved in a \$4-billion international deal that "reeks of incompetence or fraud or both," Kampelman withdrew his name and Johnson was forced to appoint someone else.

The Congressman gets much of his information on wasteful spending and unethical activities through tips from reporters. Clark Mollenhoff, the Washington bureau chief of the *Des Moines Register*, who calls Gross a "genuine liberal," says he frequently gives bits of information to Gross resulting in seven to ten stories a year. "We've got something going all the time," Mollenhoff says. He gives a perhaps inflated estimate that from 20 to 40 other reporters also give tips to Gross, who makes the accusations public when he feels sure of their accuracy. Gross' two chief assistants, Bob Case and Julian Morrison, are both former reporters themselves, but the Congressman denies that this is anything more than a coincidence.

By Washington standards Gross leads a spartan existence, so much so that some believe he finds the concept of pleasure offensive. While he labors on Capitol Hill during the day, his wife is at home reading and underlining for him. By the time he returns home, she has put the material she thinks he should read on a table next to his easy chair. At the end of the evening, if there is time, the couple plays a game of cribbage, then goes to bed. Gross has boasted of the fact that he does not own a tuxedo, nor his wife an evening gown. Several years ago he expressed shock that the Reverend Bill D. Moyers, special assistant to President Johnson, danced the watusi and frug at a party at the Smithsonian Institution. Gross himself infrequently indulges in fresh-water fishing, his only hobby. Known privately as a gentle, gracious man, his friends include former Senator Eugene McCarthy, who once reflected on Gross: "He has always proceeded with good spirit."

Gross gives the impression of a gruff, hard-bitten, non-nonsense curmudgeon, but this is to some extent a pose, a self-protective device. During an interview in his office, he is interrupted by five loud rings announcing a House session at noon. He stops for a moment and says, "That could ring once, and you could hear it, and you'd be put on notice that there was to be a session of Congress at noon, but it rings five times. There's an old story in the Navy: 'If it moves, salute it; if it stands still, paint it; and if you write about it, make 10 copies.'" Then, without a trace of a smile, he returns to his original subject. Rep. Frank Thompson says that after he acknowledged Gross' birthday on the floor of the House last year, Gross met with him at the rear of the House chamber. Gross first upbraided Thompson for mentioning his birthday, then smiled for a moment and said, "Thanks."

Several congressmen believe Gross has mellowed over the years. Following the death of Rep. Robert J. Corbett in April, Gross became the ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Rep. Edward J. Derwinski, who ranks immediately behind Gross in both the Foreign Affairs Committee and Post Office and Civil Service Committee, says, "H.R. has already done more in a month than Corbett did in years. He consults with us. He's had meetings. He's considerate of all the members. He's an extremely attentive ranking member to his people. I think he recognizes he has a responsibility to the other members of the party. He's no longer H. R. Gross the gadfly, he's H. R. Gross the ranking member." Derwinski says that when a junket proposal in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee came up, "He could have made it more uncomfortable if he wanted to. But he just went through the motions of opposing as we passed the travel resolution. He no longer has the same vehemence as he did before." Morris Udall, who is also on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, says, "Responsibility is sobering. Gross is not being as unreasonable as was feared." Gross denies that he has mellowed.

SLOUCHING TOWARD IOWA

With his constant attendance on the House floor, his careful consideration of every bill, his careful consideration of every bill, his desire to truly debate legislation on the floor, and his relatively minor role in committee work, Gross probably comes closer to embodying the grade school textbook's conception of a congressman than any other member. A literalist, Gross believes he is doing what the framers of the Constitution had in mind.

In his newsletter Gross once cited approvingly a statement by Barry Goldwater: "The challenge is not to find new or different truths, but to learn to apply established truths to the problems of the contemporary world." Gross embodies the old values that he thinks are disappearing from America: simplicity, frugality, integrity, diligence, and God-fearing religiosity. We have gone wrong, he thinks, in allowing an all-encompassing federal bureaucracy to control our lives and diminish our freedoms.

Rep. Otto Passman, one of Gross' admirers, accurately describes the thrust of Gross' efforts in Congress: "I came out of the free enterprise system, but it seems that now we are on the road to socialism. The government will control people's lives from cradle to grave, and the people won't fight it because they haven't experienced democracy. With socialism, putting people on the dole, you paralyze initiative and deaden incentive. There's never been a democracy that's lasted more than 200 years, and this country is 181 years old now. Gross has slowed down the trend to socialism from a walk to a crawl, but he hasn't stopped it."

To Gross, that rough beast slouching towards us is socialism. He prides himself on having identified the animal for us, and if he could, he would slay it. But he is no fool, and he knows that parliamentary gimmicks are no match for this beast. Consequently, even accolades like the following, from Rep. William J. Scherle, one of Congress' more determined reactionary members, do not cheer him: "It's interesting to find out how many times this renowned scholar has predicted what was going to happen, how year after year his statements have come true, but not only that, how many people have to eat crow . . . I think that anybody who ever gets the books and papers of H. R. Gross probably will own one of the most gratifying gifts anybody could ever receive."

In a few years Gross will retire to his home in Waterloo. It is easy to imagine him there, trying to live the leisure life that a man with a career of hard work behind him is entitled to. He'll go to church on Sundays and play cribbage at night. He'll read the papers, and see the evidences of Uncle Sucker's latest follies, and hope for a few more years before the beast reaches Iowa.

CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS IN OTHER COUNTRIES: SWEDEN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the child-care legislation which will soon be before this House, I would like to share with my colleagues some of the recent studies done on day care in other countries. We often neglect to learn from the development and growth of institutions in other nations. Because the United States is something of a late-comer to the field of day care, I think it might be valuable to learn more about the day-care institutions of the Soviet Union, Israel, Sweden, France, and Eastern Europe.

While not all child-care practices of these countries are applicable to the problems of the United States, certainly the Soviet Union and the countries of Western Europe face similar problems as industrialized nations with highly developed systems of technology, education and mass communications.

In the next few days I will submit for inclusion in the RECORD studies of child care in the Soviet Union conducted by Urie Bronfenbrenner, one of the foremost authorities in comparative studies of the United States and the Soviet Union's educational systems, and a series of studies of child-care arrangements in East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Israel, and France.

The following report on child-care centers in Sweden was obtained by one of my staff members who recently made a tour of day-care facilities in Sweden. The author, Siv Thorsell is a consultant to the Swedish Government on child-care centers.

I was particularly struck by the fact that the different facilities in Sweden are referred to as child-care centers. This in many ways reflects the difference in

emphasis between a child-oriented and time-oriented system. Much of the "day care" terminology we use seems to be concerned only with time rather than children.

The fact that child-care centers are a necessary part of a society in which family patterns are constantly shifting is a growing element in the Swedish attitude toward child-care centers. As Mr. Thorsell points out in his conclusion:

The view that children need both the preschool and the home is now gaining acceptance in Sweden. It is unreasonable to demand that the parents should meet all the child's needs, still less that the mother should accept responsibility for the child's upbringing to the extent she does now. This responsibility must be shared by both parents, both of whom need outside support.

For Children's Minds—Not Just to Mind the Children by Siv Thorsell from a report entitled "Before School Starts" available from the Swedish Institute, Hamngatan 27, P.O. Box 7072, S-103 Stockholm, Sweden. (The Swedish Institute is a nonpolitical organization chartered to run cultural and exchange programs with other countries and to furnish information on Swedish subject matter of general interest.)

The article follows:

FOR CHILDREN'S MINDS—NOT JUST TO MIND THE CHILDREN
(By Siv Thorsell)

For their personal development, children need the stimulating contacts and outside impulses offered by our child centres.

Should preschools (day-nurseries and nursery schools) look like the home, and function in the same way as the home? Obviously, they must offer children what is valuable in a good home environment; they must offer protection, food and warmth, security and human contact. That is to say they must satisfy certain fundamental physical, emotional and social needs. There are also certain things that modern homes are unable to provide to a sufficient degree; the children have limited opportunities of making contact with others, and it is often difficult to meet their need for intellectual stimulation. The home, the residential environment, is the result of many compromises in which the children's interests tend to suffer. Preschools can offer a children's environment in the true sense, thus becoming not only a sort of reserve home but also an amusing and stimulating "place of work".

Swedish preschools are classified as either day-nurseries or nursery schools. The day-nurseries look after children for five or more hours when parents are at work, while the nursery schools usually receive children in groups for three hours. After a long period of stagnation, the number of day-nurseries has begun to increase steadily. The need, however, is still far greater than the supply. Nursery schools have expanded considerably ever since the war and continue to outnumber the day-nurseries, but there are still relatively few of them. At present, roughly half of all Swedish children below school age can attend a nursery school or day-nursery for a year or more before starting school.

In recent years, the Government has taken a number of measures to stimulate the provision of day-nurseries. The state grants available have been increased on two occasions, and the state now provides considerable sums towards the erection and maintenance of day-nurseries and free-time centres for school children. As will be mentioned below, day-nurseries, nursery schools and free-

time centres are jointly referred to as "child centres."

A Royal Commission has been formulating the aims of activities at nursery schools and day-nurseries. The Commission is also to propose a basic pedagogic programme for preschools. The next stage of its work will be to study the possible introduction of a compulsory, public preschool system, which will allow all children within a certain age range to attend part-time or full-time.

This account is mainly a description of the situation at present; the scope, activities, administration, financing, and staff of Swedish preschools. It concludes with an attempt to describe the possible scale and nature of activities in the future. There is strong support not only for an expansion of the day-nurseries, but also for a broadening of activities so as to guarantee every child the opportunity to attend a preschool. Actual activities at these schools are also the subject of lively discussion, and an attempt will be made to outline certain views that have been put forward.

SWEDISH PRESCHOOLS

Swedish preschools do not at present offer any direct preparation for the schools, and provide very little in the way of actual teaching. The term preschool, in this context, includes as mentioned both the full-time "day-nursery" and the part-time "nursery school".

In the day-nurseries the children of gainfully employed parents are looked after. The children spend at least five hours a day at the nursery. Ages range between six months and seven years, but departments for the youngest children are not available at all nurseries. Nurseries accepting children under the age of two are concentrated mainly to the three main cities of Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö. The number of children who can be accepted, however, exceeds the official number of places, since a surplus intake of 20 per cent is allowed.

How far have we succeeded in meeting the requirements of working parents for organized supervision and care of the type provided at day-nurseries? From January 1, 1969, such activities are subsidized by the state. It is generally believed that the family day-nurseries will help fill the gap for a reasonably short period, and that they will decline in importance as more regular day-nurseries are built. The emphasis on day-nurseries stems mainly from their being the safest and most reliable solution for both the children and their parents, providing the staff, premises, equipment, toys and pedagogic aids that will create the most stimulating environment, one which will promote the children's development socially, emotionally and intellectually.

Nursery schools, as I have said, are considerably more common than day-nurseries. In principle, they should cater to children between the ages of four and seven, but the majority of children attending nursery schools at present are six-year-olds, and access to nursery schools varies from district to district. The predominance of six-year-olds is caused by the short supply in relation to the demand. Only a few cities and municipalities provide preschools on sufficiently large a scale to allow acceptance of children from the age of five, permitting them to attend for two years.

As a rule, a nursery school or department of a nursery school will take a group of about twenty children in the morning, and another group of twenty in the afternoon. One nursery school teacher is usually responsible on her own for a nursery school or department of a nursery school within a child centre, as compared with two teachers for each day-nursery department. The individual child will spend about three hours a day at the nursery school, five days a week. These schools follow the regular division of the year into terms,

which means that they do not function during the summer (for about three months), or around Christmas and the New Year.

Child centres is a term used jointly for day-nurseries, nursery schools and free-time centres and will be used frequently in this booklet. Free-time centres, which are to be found so far mainly in Stockholm, look after the younger schoolchildren during the part of the day when they are not at school. It is still more common for day-nurseries and nursery schools to be separate, but the institutions now being built often combine both forms of activity. In a few cases, free time centres for schoolchildren have been combined with a day-nursery and/or nursery school.

From preschool to school

Swedish children start school in their seventh year but can receive special permission to start earlier. For a number of years, a "school-readiness test" has been given to all children before they start school. Previously, a child who was found insufficiently mature could be kept waiting for an additional year, during which he was permitted at best to attend a nursery school. The system now being introduced means abandoning the "school-readiness test" and also means that all normally gifted children should start school at the regular time. If necessary, children with difficulties should be taught in a special "school-readiness class" or receive special instruction while attending a normal class. Children, for instance, who have difficulties in learning to read can obtain assistance in a "remedial reading clinic." Instead of constructing the school in a given way and trying to fit all children to this pattern, attempts are now made to create a school to fit the children, with a maximum of individualized teaching. The whole concept of "readiness for school" is being abandoned. It is not intended that children who have difficulty in keeping up should have to repeat a whole year; instead, assistance must be made available at the points where the child encounters particular difficulty.

Free-time centres for schoolchildren are considered to be a great value, especially for younger schoolchildren whose parents are working, since children during their first years at school attend for only a few hours a day. In the first grade children attend 19 hours a week, in the second 20 hours a week and in the third 25 hours a week.

Institutions for young children are not simply "parking places"—they must function also as pedagogic centres.

Many people hesitate to refer to day-nurseries and nursery schools as "institutions." An institution is regarded as something closed and isolated, which is the last thing we want our preschools to be. Unfortunately, in Sweden as elsewhere, the special facilities provided for young children are often "closed," in the same way as the majority of homes. Schools are also closed institutions. Moreover, the new type of school is being made increasingly open to the outside world.

Community planning has not catered particularly to the needs of children. The new districts being built are for the most part purely residential areas, in which very little goes on. The shops are placed in the big centres. Places of work of all kinds, such as offices and workshops, are concentrated in the centre of town or in special industrial areas. Many believe that a residential area should provide an everyday environment which is above all friendly to children, a place with playgrounds, recreation grounds and other places where children and adults can meet. An incipient interest in such aspects of our environment has shown us that the residential areas now in existence, and under construction, by no means meet requirements. It should be borne in mind here that Sweden, which enjoys a relatively large

land area in relation to population, has experienced in recent decades a large-scale migration to the urban areas. Up to the mid-19th century Sweden was very much of an agrarian society. Not until the beginning of the 1930's did industry and services take the lead over agriculture. Today almost half the Swedish population is engaged in these sectors while the percentage occupied in agriculture and forestry has fallen to about 10 percent.

Child centres (including free-time centres for schoolchildren), with the opportunities they offer for activities and contacts with the outside world, have an important function to fulfill. The requirements thus far made of the physical plant have related to such elementary and of course very important aspects as spaciousness, a situation at ground level, satisfactory daylight lighting, adequate sanitation, and sensible planning.

General regulations of this type have been published by the National Board of Health and Welfare, the ultimate supervisory authority in this field. The Board has also specified in detail how premises should be arranged. It is stipulated, for instance, that there should be an indoor play surface of at least 32 sq. ft. per child—preferably more. The outside surface available should be about 160—110 sq. ft. per child—preferably more. The minimum total play surface of the nursery schools is 110 sq. ft.

The Board recommends that child centres should be housed in separate buildings, particularly in the case of day-nurseries. A child centre can also be arranged on the ground floor of a larger building, provided that an outdoor playground can be made available directly adjoining the centre. Sample drawings for the use of local authorities and others have been published by the Board, which has also approved a number of "type solutions" submitted by the manufacturers of prefabricated buildings. Many of the child centres now being built are housed in free-standing prefabricated premises of this kind. It is not unusual, however, to use existing detached residences.

It is also emphasized that child centres should be as flexible as possible, so that they can be used if necessary for other purposes than originally intended. This is because requirements in residential areas shift so rapidly, in new areas there is a great need of premises for preschool children, but in a few years the emphasis can be on facilities for schoolchildren. It must then be easy to adapt premises so that they can be used for older children.

The Board's recommendations also stress that the preschool premises should be home-like. The nursery schools are a supplement to the play environment of the home, while the day-nurseries and free-time centres also are a substitute for care in the home. The preschools (and even free-time centres) must thus be able to function as homes, but also offer something more than this. This brings us to the actual aims of the preschools, and how they are to be realized.

PRESENT AIMS OF THE PRESCHOOL

According to the Board's recommendations, preschools are to provide a complement to upbringing in the home, at the same time offering children contacts with other environments and preparing them for the demands of school life. It is emphasized that the preschools should work in close contact with the home.

The day-nurseries, and the free-time centres, are a necessary condition for many mothers to take employment. The Board's recommendations further state that the nursery schools "can also give housewives the time off from their children that they need to organize their housework in a practical manner". It should perhaps be added that the Board has neglected to stress that housewives

also need time off, not only for housework but also for their own sake—to be able simply to relax, to study, meet their friends, etc.

The purpose of upbringing is to promote the development of children's personalities and their social adjustment, and in this respect both the nursery schools and day-nurseries are to function as a complement to the family. Their pedagogic programme is entirely identical. What the day-nurseries offer in addition is daily care, meals and rest, and a longer period of play outdoors.

The Board's pedagogic recommendations emphasize particularly the role of the preschools in promoting independence and social adjustment. The children learn to function together in a group. According to the Board it is important also "that the children should jointly obtain certain basic knowledge of conditions outside the home, for instance by excursions or field trips. Such experiences can be pedagogically exploited in group work or free creative work of different kinds".

STAFF

Day-nurseries are staffed by nursery school teachers, children's nurses and—in some cases—instructors in child care. (Apart, of course, from staff not directly concerned with the children.) The number of children per staff member varies between age groups. The principle is that there should be fewer children to a department, the younger they are. In day-nurseries, two nursery school teachers should be attached to each department, in addition to the principal. If nursery school teachers are unobtainable, qualified children's nurses can be employed. Apart from kitchen staff and similar help, there should be one staff member to every five children. If the day-nursery has a department for babies (6-24 months), which is where the nurses normally work, then the personnel requirement is one staff member to every four children.

In a nursery school with one department in the morning and another in the afternoon, activities are the responsibility of only one nursery school teacher.

At a large number of child centres there are also trainees who require practical experience for admission to a nursery school teachers' training-college as part of their course. Such trainees, however, cannot be counted as staff for the purpose of meeting the Board's requirements.

Further assistance at the child centres is provided by child visitors, who also look after, in the home, sick children whose parents are at work. Such child visitors are employed by the local authority, but not directly attached to any child centre. Their services are provided via municipal "domestic aid committees." This form of service is not yet offered on any major scale.

Nursery school teachers undergo two years of training at state nursery school teachers' training colleges. Entrance requirements are the nine-year compulsory school and certain practical experience as school trainees. At present there are 14 nursery school teachers' training colleges in different parts of Sweden.

The training of children's nurses (nursery nurses) can comprise either a one-term course in the care of small children, plus practical experience among younger preschool children, or a thirty-four week course covering the care of both babies and small children.

Instructors in child care, who are qualified to become the principals of homes for babies or of day-nurseries with special departments for babies, undergo special training lasting for three years. Requirements for admission to such training include the nine-year compulsory school, domestic science school, and training as a children's nurse.

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCES

Preschools (both day-nurseries and nursery schools) are under the supervision of the National Board of Health and Welfare, which is under the Ministry for Health and Welfare. The regional authority is the county administration and the local authority is the municipality.

A number of large municipalities, which run preschools on a large scale, employ consultants or inspectors who are responsible for coordinating the activities of day-nurseries, nursery schools, free-time centres, and child-minding, including the training and administration of assisting staff. In Stockholm the mental health organization also has a preschool team to assist staff in the field of mental health.

A preschool can be under the local authority, an association, a company, or a private association or person. As shown by the following table, most day-nurseries are under the jurisdiction of the local authority. Nursery schools too and usually under the local authority, but quite a few are run by associations, in most cases with the help of local authority grants. Anyone setting up a child centre can obtain a state "starting grant" and cover most other initial costs by a state loan.

Starting grants are available for premises arranged so that they can be used for the supervision of children throughout the day, or for at least five hours a day. The recreation of day-nurseries and free-time centres is thus subsidized by the state, and the same is true of institutions functioning as both day-nurseries (and/or free-time centres) and nursery schools. Generally speaking, child centre premises attract both a grant and a loan, if the disposition and fixtures of the building are planned for group activities by children, and all the children accepted can stay there for a minimum of five hours a day. Those setting up a child centre must also undertake to make all places available for activities lasting for at least five hours per child per day. This means that the institution must offer cooked food and facilities for rest and sleep. If these conditions are met, nursery school departments are also eligible for grants and loans.

Child centre premises should be planned in consultation with the Board of Health and Welfare; it also determines the number of places, which must always be set in a given relationship to the space available and its disposition.

Grants towards the establishment of nursery schools can be applied for from the State Inheritance Fund. If the nursery school is in a residential area eligible for state loans, then a state housing loan can be obtained.

In the case of state grants towards running expenses the requirement, again, is that activities cover at least five hours per child per day. It is also assumed that they will be under the supervision of qualified staff, and that the premises will be suitably equipped. If a given institution, for instance, has both day-nursery and nursery school departments, then a grant for current operations will be paid on the basis of all places, provided that at least two-thirds are utilized for supervision the whole day, or for at least five hours a day. State grants have been structured in this way because the state is concerned primarily with providing help to gainfully employed parents.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS

The state's opportunity to influence the building of day-nurseries lies in the generous provision of grants for erection and maintenance. Both grants and loans have been offered on a greatly increased scale during the sixties, and have contributed immensely to the accelerated rate of expansion.

A driving force has been the "Central Committee for Cooperation" appointed in 1963. It consists, among others, of representatives

from the Board of Health and Welfare, the Labour Market Board, the Board of Education, the Association of Swedish Local Authorities, the Swedish Employers' Confederation and the Swedish Trade Union Confederation. This committee is actively concerned with studies and information. Information, which is aimed directly at the local authorities, relates to population changes, employment, female participation in the labour market, and the technical, economic and organizational factors involved in the planning and building of day-nurseries and free-time centres. In 1964, a scheme was initiated to create County Committees for day-nurseries and free-time centres. These latter, which are now in operation in several counties, promote the growth of child centres within their respective areas.

Child centres and service to promote equality between the sexes

Underlying the strong increase in the number of day-nurseries is the intensive discussion being waged about equality between the sexes. This discussion has brought out latent needs that have long existed. Those women with young children who want and need to take gainful employment must have a real opportunity to do so, and it is realized that the best long-term solution is the provision of day-nurseries and free-time centres.

At the same time, it has been emphasized how one-sided it is to assign responsibility for the care and upbringing of children primarily to women, and hardly at all to men. Progressive opinion aims at a more even distribution of responsibility and rights between men and women in respect of work in the home, and participation in the life of the community at large. Day-nurseries, free-time centres, and rational personal and family services, are an important aid in solving this problem. However, the parents of small children must also be offered generous terms in respect of leaves of absence and shorter working hours, without this leading to discrimination in respect of their future careers and current and future social benefits (unemployment benefits, pensions, sickness benefits, etc.). It has been made clear that, inevitably, "having children costs money"—but that it should not necessarily be a burden to the parents for the whole of their life as it generally is at present, at least for the women. Mothers are now asked to sacrifice their personal and financial independence, possibilities of advancement, improved earnings, interesting jobs, civic duties, etc., simply because tradition has assigned them practically total responsibility for children and housework. Stockholm, which has a relatively high number of day-nurseries, was the first town to set a definite target for expansion, namely that at least 80 per cent of the children of working parents should have access to a day-nursery. This target has already been reached in some districts.

The same standard is recommended by the Central Committee for Cooperation. The realization of such a target would mean about 80,000 day-nursery places in Sweden, as compared with the 16,000 or so in existence. According to forecasts of future participation rates on the labour market, over 100,000 places in day-nurseries must be available by 1975 if the 50 per cent rule is to be fulfilled. About 2,700 new places have been created in the past year (1967/1968). Even if growth continues to accelerate slightly, it is hardly probable that the Committee's recommendations can be realized.

A COMMON PRESCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE FUTURE

For those children who cannot obtain places—whether both or only one parent is at work during the day—the question can arise of making it possible, on a much larger scale, for a child to attend preschool for part of the day over several years. The Swedish Central

Organization of Salaried Employees has demanded such a reform. It wants to make it compulsory for all local authorities—with strong support from the state—to offer all children the possibility of attending preschool for at least two years. As already mentioned, this question is now being considered by a Royal Commission. The directive given to this Royal Commission emphasizes that the aim of educational planning in recent years has been to offer a good school education regardless of the district of residence, financial status of the parents, and other circumstances. It is stressed that this process of democratization should be broadened to cover circumstances influencing the initial position of the child on starting school.

This will make great demands on the preschool system, and probably require some change in its aims and the structure of its activities. This, however, is something that the Commission must first consider. Even if the question does not arise of making a fixed curriculum, the Commission's directive suggests that there is reason to compile more concrete recommendations on the nature and structure of activities. Studies made on the effect of attending a preschool suggest that it is often relatively slight in the case of children from families that are well-off and themselves make an effort to promote the child's development, i.e. largely families with a good education. In the case, however, of children from less adequate environments, the effect of preschool attendance is marked. It is striking how the consequences of these findings have been ignored. To begin with, it is obvious that children from different environments get a very different start in life—a situation that could be improved by a real investment in preschools. Secondly, these studies suggest that children generally have a development potential that is not exploited either by the homes or by our present type of preschools. It can be suspected that the adults determining the conditions under which our children grow up—by virtue of their position as parents, teachers, or public officials—do not really know what is best for the children. In many countries, the preschool is a more conservative institution than the school. This is natural enough, since the younger the child, the greater the degree of control that adults can exercise. Also, preschools in Sweden—and in other countries—are not subject to the same reformatory zeal and interest on the part of informed opinion. Nor does the legislation provide for the same supervision as in the case of schools. However, the view that children need both the preschool and the home is now gaining acceptance in Sweden. It is unreasonable to demand that the parents should meet all the child's needs, still less that the mother should accept responsibility for the child's upbringing to the extent she does now. This responsibility must be shared by both parents, both of whom need outside support.

OUTREACH PLAN REACHES HARBOR TERRACE YOUTHS

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1969 authorized HEW to provide funds for communities striving to better conditions for youth development.

In Fall River, these funds have gone to the Outreach program, sponsored jointly

by the Family Services Association and the Fall River YMCA. The program has been scoring many successes in providing a healthier community for the inhabitants at the Harbor Terrace housing project. I submit this Fall River Herald News article which tells of these endeavors and their successes:

[From the Fall River (Mass.) Herald News, Aug. 11, 1971]

OUTREACH PLAN REACHES HARBOR TERRACE YOUTHS

Harbor Terrace is the scene of a new social service experiment, sponsored jointly by the Family Service Association and the Fall River YMCA.

The Family Service Outreach Program is an unusual instance of federal funding to private agencies. Also, it marks one of the first examples of interagency cooperation for youth development and delinquency prevention.

Concerned equally with the youth and the parents of Harbor Terrace, Outreach takes what Family Service Association executive director Donald J. Emond calls "a new approach." Its aim is first to find out what the project residents really need, and then to work for personal development and improved communication among the residents and the social organizations which exist to serve their various needs.

According to Emond, one of the most effective ways to help people with common life problems is to "provide positive models." This is where the Outreach staff comes in.

Richard Desrosiers, Outreach director, spends most of his time at Harbor Terrace. The young social worker, a Tiverton resident, first became involved in this city through work study programs during his student days at Providence College.

Desrosiers worked for several months with former Family Service staff member Robert Sutton, who established youth programs at several housing projects, and drew up the proposal for the Outreach federal grant. Sutton, now with the Child Protective Services in Hyannis, is still a consultant to the Outreach program. He returns to the city once a week.

In continuing the work begun by Sutton, Desrosiers is assisted by a 15 member staff, including professionals, Neighborhood Youth Corps members, and volunteers. Among the Outreach workers are Miss Vicki Larsen of Somerset and Miss Kathleen Ryan of this city. Assisting agencies include the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, and the First Baptist Church, which has lent its arts and crafts "funmobile."

An unprecedented bright light on the Outreach horizon is a grant of \$24,100 received this summer from the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The granting office is the HEW Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration.

Outreach summer activities include handball, baseball, archery, swim sessions at the YMCA, fishing trips to the Taunton River, and two weeks of day recreation at Camp Noquchoke.

Harbor Terrace mothers are invited to swim at the Y and to join their children at camp. The mothers are the first to say that something new has happened in the daily atmosphere of the housing project.

"The kids have something to look forward to, and they think the world of Dick," a mother said. Another mentioned that her teenage son is involved in the program as a Youth Corps worker. "They learn many new skills, and find their way to good jobs afterward," she said.

Outreach worker Wayne Harris knows the needs of the people well. Now 22, he has lived at Harbor Terrace since he was 3. Ath-

letic, yet easy-going, he guides many of the sports events, and is on 24-hour call for counselling.

Russell Babcock, director of the YMCA, stopped by at Harbor Terrace for a talk with Desrosiers and Harris. "The federal government should spend more money to aid such programs as this, conducted by responsible organized private agencies," he said.

In programs such as Outreach, the federal government is giving a needed boost to agencies which have long experience in service to people, performing key jobs quietly from year to year, the YMCA director said.

Many Harbor Terrace children live in homes lacking a father's presence. They welcome the arrival of Desrosiers, clustering about him and telling him about their daily concerns. One little girl offered him a gift, a book of matches she had picked up. "But they're all wet," he said, accepting them in a gentle, joking tone. "Oh, no, they work," his small friend assured him.

Another concrete proof of Outreach effectiveness is the fact that juvenile court referrals have recently decreased by 66 per cent in the Harbor Terrace neighborhood.

Desrosiers noted that minor criminal activity is often the result of an individual's failure to perform in a structured social atmosphere.

"Not everyone learns how to work with rules. That's why our main teaching function is to reach out to the kids on their own level and help them to learn how to relate to each other, how to lose, and how to win," said the counselor.

We also want to decrease the strain in institutional ties," he said, looking forward to the school year, and speaking of a possible school liaison component. Outreach workers would help parents to approach teachers with confidence, for increased mutual understanding of the children's situations and needs.

The strength of the program is enhanced by the 75-year experience of the Family Service Association which, as Emond said, will continue to operate, whether or not it receives large government fundings.

Family Service is a United Fund agency. As such, it has continuity, along with a solid core of professional expertise on social, legal, and welfare problems. "We are essentially a family counselling agency," Emond said.

Family Service officials regret that the Outreach program cannot, at this point, be set up in all the city's housing projects. Paying tribute to the groundwork accomplished by Sutton, Emond said that FSA had overextended itself in the past, trying to serve several projects at once with limited funding and staff.

"Now, realizing how much attention is needed, we would rather be effective in one project."

CONSUMERS NEED A GUARANTY ON GUARANTEES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, no one really expects that every product on the market will be absolutely perfect and never break down. That would be silly. But there is no danger of that happening. In fact, it seems that just the opposite may be true. The level of shoddiness is rising to greater and greater heights. And while the quality of the product is diminishing, there is a simultaneous increase in the difficulty consumers face in getting defective merchandise fixed.

One gets the distinct impression that American business is ashamed of the merchandise it produces and sells; otherwise it would not be so reluctant to stand behind its work. Most guarantees and warranties the American people receive on the products they buy are not worth the paper they are printed on. I am sure everyone in this room can cite several personal experiences with product warranties that did not quite cover what they were supposed to or were understood to.

There is the television set that has spent more time in the shop than in your home. The car that seems to have a built-in timer that makes it break down the day after the warranty expires. The "no-strings" guaranty that simply requires you to send the product back to the manufacturer for free repair even when the shipping costs more than the item did when new. And on and on and on, ad nauseum.

These are some of the inconveniences and abuses consumers are forced to endure daily. The issue of consumer protection is essentially an issue of honesty.

Time and again buyers are faced with confusing procedures, unreasonable time delays, and exorbitant, hidden charges in their efforts to get defective products repaired. Sometimes these problems result from deliberately vague or misleading wording. Other times they are a result of a manufacturer's or seller's reluctance to provide adequate repair procedures and facilities. In any case the consumer is the one who suffers.

Examples of this kind of activity are numberless. For instance, a well-known piano manufacturer, Baldwin, "agrees to promptly repair or replace without charge any part which is found to be defective." However, the piano must be delivered to their factory or other place designated by them "and the transportation costs borne by the purchaser." If a repair facility is not close at hand the transportation expense can be enormous. To ship a piano, for example, from Baltimore to Washington, D.C., where Baldwin does have a repair facility, a person would have to pay out of his own pocket between \$75 and \$100. This assumes of course that the manufacturer's facility is that close. Imagine the expense of shipping your favorite piano to Cincinnati, Baldwin's main repair facility. It could be cheaper to throw it away and buy a new one.

The tire industry is another offender. While companies advertise at "list prices" they rarely sell at these prices. In fact, the actual sale price may be as much as 50 percent below list. Under their prorating system, if a tire is faulty, credit toward the purchase of a new one is calculated as a percentage of the tread left. If half the tread is left, the consumer generally pays half the price—the list price—of a new tire, not half the current going market price. So, if he is charged 50 percent of the list price, the value of the guaranty is diminished, if not corrupted.

These abuses are also widespread in the auto industry. Consider the case of the motorist with a cracked exhaust manifold. Does his warranty cover this?

Of course, the dealer says, unless the damage was caused by a rock which flew up under the car and hit the manifold, which is on the top part of the engine. The chances of such a freak happening are minute. If the cause of the broken manifold is such an unusual accident, the customer winds up paying about \$45; if it is a defective part, the company pays. Now try and guess what the dealer is going to tell the customer who wants his manifold fixed.

Perhaps the worst offense lies in the hidden labor costs. Buyers are told that merchandise will be repaired and parts replaced free of charge. However, the purchaser must pay the cost of labor. Picture the surprised buyer, when he is forced to pay \$45 to repair a refrigerator worth only \$50.

Warranties are only as good as the manufacturer's willingness to stand behind them. Unfortunately, the batting average of business is frighteningly close to zero. To say the least, it is disappointing. Rather than stand behind their work, too many manufacturers would rather hide behind a veil of vague, unsteady, noncommittal evasiveness. Fraudulent and misleading guarantees cost the consumer millions of dollars every year.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 5037, the Consumer Products Warranty and Guaranty Act. The Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is currently holding hearings on this subject and hopefully will soon report out a strong bill that will give consumers the protection they need and deserve.

My bill is a guaranty on guarantees—and a strong, meaningful one. It provides, for the first time, real and significant protection against fraudulent or misleading guarantees and warranties. There are a number of significant provisions which I would like to point out. **This bill:**

First, extends supplier liability to all guaranteed items with a value of \$5 or more. How many Americans have had a \$5 shirt, a \$7 coffee grinder, an \$8 iron, a \$9 electric clock or a \$10 wristwatch fall apart a month after its purchase? How many Americans have written to manufacturers seeking satisfaction, only to be told that their warranty does not cover that particular repair? Consumers are lost in a maze of legalistic loopholes that laymen cannot and should not be expected to understand.

Second, it forces suppliers to specify in writing any parts or repairs which are excluded in the terms of the guaranty; requires them to specify in writing a step-by-step list of procedures which the consumer must take to recover losses; and directs them to set a deadline for making the needed repairs.

They would be required to go on record, standing behind the integrity of their product.

Third, calls upon the manufacturers to disclose the kind of coverage buyers are getting.

Too many consumers have returned defective merchandise to the factory only to find that their warranty does not cover

the particular repairs needed. Too many buyers have ended up paying for a certain percentage of the labor not covered by their particular agreement. H.R. 5037 puts an end to this. Under the provisions of this bill, buyers will know from the beginning whether or not theirs is a full or partial guaranty. They will be sure of the costs they will meet in seeking repairs on merchandise they have purchased.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that H.R. 5037 is another step toward granting the American consumer full equality in the marketplace, something he woefully lacks. It forces the maker to be fair and honest in his dealings with the buyer.

FEDERAL HEALTH BENEFITS LEGISLATION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee today commenced hearings on pending health benefits legislation.

As a member of that subcommittee and as the sponsor of three bills relating to the Federal Government's contribution to employees' health benefits, I ask that my testimony before the subcommittee be included in the RECORD at this point:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

Mr. Chairman, in coming to testify before this Subcommittee, on which I serve, in support of legislation to increase the Federal Government's contribution to health benefits' coverage, I feel almost as though I'm bringing coals to Newcastle. I note that four members of the Subcommittee, including our Chairman, are co-sponsors of both H.R. 7807 and H.R. 9620 which we are considering today. In addition, during the hearing of this Subcommittee on June 23, 1971, I was pleased to note that several of the other members of the Subcommittee, while not sponsors of the legislation themselves, do indeed support it.

I feel, Mr. Chairman and fellow members, as though I've been this route before. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that very early in my first term in Congress I introduced H.R. 10593 to authorize the Federal Government to pay 100 percent of the cost of certain minimum benefits which would be provided for all employees, annuitants, and their families. I re-introduced this legislation on January 29 of this year and it is now before us as H.R. 2586.

I think I have come to realize, Mr. Chairman, in the nearly three years that I have served in the Congress, that my 100% bill is a goal for which to strive but the steps toward that goal must be taken gradually. For this reason, I also cosponsored during the 91st Congress H.R. 16968 which would have authorized a 50% contribution, allowing the Federal Government and the Federal employee to share the health benefits burden equally.

We are all aware, Mr. Chairman, what happened to that bill. Although the House of Representatives passed a 50% bill, the con-

ference committee diminished the contribution from an equal 50-50 share to a 40-60 share with the employee assuming the larger burden. For this reason, on April 27, 1971, just two years after introducing my first 100% bill, I cosponsored H.R. 7807 to try once again this year to increase the benefits to the 50-50 level which the House approved last year.

Through this brief resume of legislative activity, I have stated the recent history of health benefits legislation. If we go back into the earlier history of this program we find that when the Federal employees' health benefits program was being set up in 1960, it was thought that the Federal Government would pay approximately one-half of the cost of the premium. The assumption was that the majority of employees would opt for the low—rather than for the high benefit plan. However, the great majority, 85 percent currently, of employees choose the high-benefit option and the Federal Government's share of the cost was about 38 percent when the program became effective in 1960.

Except for some low-option plans and certain self-only enrollments, the contribution by the Federal Government has never equaled the proposed 50 percent of the total cost. In fact, it has never exceeded 38 percent of the overwhelming majority of employees until Public Law 91-418 authorizing the 40% contribution became effective on January 1, 1971.

I stated earlier that the House of Representatives last year originally passed the 50% bill but that the conference committee, pressured with the threat of a Presidential veto, reverted to a 40% contribution. I share your view, this comparability concept necessarily ministrations' view has changed somewhat during the past year with regard to the need for this increase. On February 18 of this year, President Nixon called on private employers to provide 65 percent of the cost of basic health insurance coverage for employees as of July 1, 1973, and 75 percent of the total cost three years later.

In view of this statement, I was pleased to join the chairman in introducing H.R. 9620, which we are also considering today. H.R. 9620 would increase the Federal Government's contribution from 40% to 55% upon enactment and thereafter increase the contribution by 5% each year until reaching 75% of the average of the subscription charges. This bill, in my view, is a foresighted, gradualistic approach to the need for updating the health benefits program to keep step with the rising cost-of-living, and the rising cost of medical expenses and insurance premiums.

The Congress has been committed for some years to the concept of Federal employee pay comparability with private industry pay. In fact, last year we were successful in seeing the enactment of Public Law 91-656, the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970. In my view, this comparability concept necessarily should include Federal employee fringe benefits as compared with those in private industry. In many companies in the private sector, management pays the entire amount of medical insurance premiums. The Federal Government is lagging in this area where it should lead.

Mr. Chairman, I would obviously prefer to see H.R. 2586—my 100% bill—become law. However, looking at our present economic and legislative situations realistically, it is more likely that H.R. 9620, which would authorize a gradual increase to 75%, would receive favorable action. In the event that neither of these alternatives is acted on, I believe the least we can settle for is H.R. 7807, increasing the contribution to the 50% level which, as I said earlier, was already approved by the House of Representatives on July 9, 1970.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to present my views.

FREDERICK M. LANGE SPEAKS ON "OUR GIVE AND TAKE WORLD"

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, since 1956 Frederick M. Lange, president of the Dallas Community Chest Trust Fund, has been going to all parts of the world at the invitation of foreign governments and officials to tell of our methods of raising funds for privately supported community agencies. He recently delivered a most enlightening lecture entitled, "Our Give and Take World," to the Austrian Committee for Social Work. This address contains an informative discussion of the partnership which exists in this country between tax-supported social welfare agencies and our many voluntary agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to my good friend, Chris Semos, a State representative in neighboring Dallas County, for calling Mr. Lange's excellent speech to my attention, and I place it in the RECORD so it may be shared by my colleagues:

OUR GIVE AND TAKE WORLD

(By Frederick M. Lange)

Our world today, beset by problems wherever you look, has had many adjectives used to describe it. They range from "unsettled" to "wide and wonderful", and they cover all the intermediary areas in between.

The one I want to talk to you about is our "give and take" world. Never has the phrase meant so much to so many people of our planet, and economists say that the basic, life-sustaining needs of millions of our people can only increase in this new decade.

It is this sobering thought that, ideally, would make every nation take a more careful look at its planning for the future. These plans naturally will evolve around the reason for any nation's being—its people. In my country, the people stand first and foremost . . . the theory being that what is good for the people is good for the nation as a whole.

And so, to bolster this foundation, there have been a number of important steps taken in the past 100 years involving action at the federal or national level, the state level and the county level of government. It may be expressed simply: Helping those who, for one reason or another, cannot help themselves. These include the physically and mentally handicapped, the underprivileged children, the aged, and many other groups that have somehow lost their solid footing on today's economic highways.

For roughly 300 years, local government carried this heavy responsibility in the United States. Then 100 years ago, many state governments moved into the picture, placing in their own constitutions laws to help care for the needy. Forty years ago, when a great economic depression swept the United States, local and state governments became helpless and turned to the national government for help.

It might sound as though this weighty problem has been a sort of "bouncing ball" thing between local, state and national government. In truth, it has been relegated through the years to whichever branch of government could best handle the situation at the time. In 1935, for example, financial help from the federal or national government for our needy citizens became a permanent thing in the United States with the estab-

lishment of our national social insurance program (following 55 years later, the pioneer program in Austria) plus our national public financial assistance programs for the aged, blind, handicapped, and dependent children. In addition to the tax-supported social welfare agencies, we have many voluntary agencies. Most, but not all, of these agencies are working together under one banner—the Community Chest—to raise millions of dollars each year.

How well do our federated fund-raising agencies do their job, and do they really raise millions of dollars for the needy? In 1969, Federated Campaigns, by whatever name, in 2600 cities and towns across the United States raised almost 816 million dollars to provide the money needed by voluntary health and welfare agencies in addition to their income from fees for service.

Since the advent of our Social Security Program in 1935, to which I have just referred, voluntary and government agencies in the United States work and cooperate much like the tenants of an ant hill or a bee hive. But—it is so important—today the private agencies are able to concentrate on preventive work. They try to keep critical situations from developing.

It has, if anything, made stronger the partnership between the national and state government and the individual citizen. There are advisory boards and auxiliaries, constantly working, always seeking to stay close to the thoughts and problems of the individual—and especially at the state and local levels. These agencies want to stay close to the people, and to keep alert to their changing needs—and they do just that.

It works both ways. The citizens participating—serving on advisory boards and committees—get the opportunity they need to learn how these tax-supported agencies function. Thus, the entire program is coordinated, and in such a way that wasted effort is minimized.

It is this working together that actually is the secret to success in this particular field. Here is just one example: The most outspoken and influential members of our own Dallas Juvenile Department are the women and men who give their time as unpaid volunteers to help in certain phases of juvenile work. This is the way they get to know what the agency does and needs—and so they are able to speak intelligently to officials of the Juvenile Department, and to those who allocate funds to it. When they speak, people listen.

Such a working partnership encourages efficiency.

A moment ago, we mentioned prevention programs, and a large portion of donations in the United States goes for such programs. Prevention means precisely what it says—prevention of problems that may affect large segments of the population economically and in many other ways.

Imagine the support people of the United States give to such groups as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Young Men's Christian Association, Young Women Christian Association, youth centers, recreation centers, day camps, overnight camps, and the like. But are these necessary social welfare programs that merit such support?

We think they are—and primarily because through constructive youth activities they help build sounder bodies, minds, and personalities. Trained in one or more of these groups, young people have a better chance to become independent adults who can cope with life and its problems.

Call it, simply, an investment in people. Looking carefully at the preventive nature of any social service program, it is easy to conclude that any comprehensive program that does not have a preventive aspect is only half complete. While first emphasis should be given to helping people in trou-

ble now—we must also look ahead and try to help people so that they will not get into serious trouble in the first place. Development of strong minds and bodies lessens vulnerability and preserves human values—which essentially are the main goals of any social service program.

The great strength of voluntary efforts at welfare in the United States comes from religious roots. Spiritual values are a prime part of the foundation of our entire program, and you can couple this with a basic, fundamental belief in the freedom and dignity of man.

Studies, analyses and diagnoses of social welfare programs have been made repeatedly in the United States, and especially in the last 50 years. The conclusion most often reached is that problems of people and the services they need to remedy them fall mostly into four categories. First, the need for basic living essentials—such as food, shelter and clothing.

Second, ill health, or the need for medical care.

Third, social maladjustments, or the need for counseling to solve personal difficulties.

And fourth, the need for recreation or leisure time activities in order to maintain mental health.

My own life has been dedicated to the principles of Federated giving. I have directed the gathering of more than \$200 million in voluntary gifts for various philanthropic purposes. I have also served as consultant for campaigns raising a like sum, and after all these years, I am more convinced than ever that the principle embodied in any United Fund or similar organization—joining together to meet the needs of our people—is the most effective way to lend the most help to the greatest number.

Each community—or each country—unquestionably is best qualified to determine operational principles of its own United Fund, or its own community chest. It depends upon resources, needs, outlook, and mood of the individual locale—and still there are a few underlying principles which could serve as basic guides to all. I hope to be able to discuss these with you while I am here, in your country.

I have talked about the recognized need for helping people to help themselves, but to complete the picture you really should know something about the history of welfare in the United States. Today, our voluntary and government agencies work side by side toward this end—they have a division of interests and a division of jurisdiction, and it likely is this very flexibility that makes our own programs so successful.

The widespread movement in the Community Chest organization in the United States was noted during the first World War. The urgent need for welfare services, both at home and overseas, resulted in many service organizations—and since they all appealed to the general public for financial support, and overpowering by-product was confusion. More than 400 communities organized what were, in those years, called war chests, and they all had definite financial goals. Many of these war chests developed later into peace time community chests.

It was soon noted that these federated or united drives garnered more money for their causes than had ever been previously raised by the organizations soliciting funds independently.

Success of these federated drives can be pointed to in terms of dollars. In 1940, only 561 Chests or United Giving Organizations raised \$86 million. In 1961 Community Chests and United Fund campaigns in 2255 United States communities raised \$497 million for use by some 30,000 participating agencies. In 1969 federated fund-raising campaigns raised \$816 million in the United States for support of 31,500 social welfare organizations. You

will note, sometimes Federated Giving is called a Community Chest and sometimes a United Fund; it is left to each city to choose its own name. We chose United Fund for our operating fund and Community Chest Trust Fund for our permanent fund, which I head as president.

Let's look at the Dallas County United Fund which, in 1970, raised its goal of \$8,499,500. The working labor force in Dallas County totals 500,000—and the 12,000 volunteer solicitors received pledges from 230,000 of those in the labor force. Most of the 73 agencies belonging to the Dallas County United Fund have, at one time or another, tried to handle their own fund drives independently. But finding this difficult, they sought out the fraternity and security and numerical power of the United Fund.

Certainly, the first goal of any federated drive must be the raising of money. But there are many other important aspects—one of the greatest is education of the general public about community welfare needs. Another is the encouragement of widespread participation of citizens who work as volunteers. Still another value is the assistance given agency programs through a sharing of their problems with citizen leaders and the resulting citizen guidance.

It follows, too, that composition of the board and executive committee is vital. Since they represent the community, these key people vouch for the efficiency and integrity of the organization itself. Such people lend confidence.

Naturally, I cannot stand here and tell you how your specific fund-raising campaign should be organized. But I can give you guide-lines, indicating some of the earlier steps to be taken—and especially if they have been successful in campaigns elsewhere.

When you talk to people about giving their own money—they themselves have to be certain that every aspect of this giving is convenient and fair. In the United States, the campaign organization is usually divided into divisions according to the major groupings of possible contributors—and this is based on their type of business and, most important, on their ability to give. In the United States, there is great cooperation from many business firms and from labor unions; for example, a worker can pledge an annual amount of money and arrange to have this particular amount deducted from his regular paychecks by the month or by the week. At the worker's request, his employer will handle the paperwork and automatically send the deduction to the United Fund or Community Chest.

In my city, most salaried workers are encouraged to give one hour's pay per month. It is called their "fair share". People in higher income brackets are naturally asked to give more generously.

So that no questions go unanswered, the United Fund sets up a speakers bureau. Comprised of people who know the answers to most questions about voluntary giving, these speakers give talks in simple and appealing terms before civic, professional, and employee groups.

The local campaign in the United States is helped tremendously by our national or federal government, primarily through our income tax laws. Under these, a corporation may make tax-free gifts for charitable purposes up to five percent of profits. Individuals can make tax-free gifts of 20 to 50 percent of adjusted income.

Federated giving is big business—and it must function on a year-round basis. A paid staff receives monthly financial reports and activity reports from each agency, receiving funds, helping to make possible budget control through the year. In the spring of each year in the U.S., leading local citizens serve on what is called "the citizens' budget committee"—an appointive committee that is divided into four subcommittees to handle

different kinds of agencies. The subcommittees commonly are: Public health and medical services, group work and recreation services, family services, and children's services.

Budget needs are carefully examined once a year—there are conferences between agency representatives and its particular budget committee group, representatives of the staff of the Community Chest, and also of the Community Welfare Council. The work of this Community Welfare Council is to help coordinate the many welfare activities in Dallas, and its work is financed by the Community Chest.

This Community Welfare Council includes in its membership all major health, welfare and recreation agencies—regardless of how they are supported. It is responsible for gathering information so that the community knows—First, which welfare problems need most attention . . . Second, which problems are changing . . . Third, which agencies can best give the needed service, and Fourth, how these needed services can be given most effectively and efficiently and with the least amount of duplication.

In summing up, let me say this: There are many ways in which the people of the world need help, and there are many ways in which it can be done. My country feels that its hard-working, conscientious, very aware Community Chest has proven itself.

Whatever other differences there may be throughout the world, most of our peoples have one common denominator—one thing that makes us all alike. It is concern—concern for our children, concern for human beings helping each other to live—and to live with dignity and purpose.

Dallas had its first successful Community Chest Campaign in 1941. There has never been a failure, although the goal has jumped from \$550,000 to \$8,500,000. Certainly, it has involved a lot of hard work by tens of thousands in those years . . . but education of the community to its own needs has been a most important factor.

Begin your own education program with a small, but selective, group of leaders in your community. Be certain that the group is comprised of ladies and gentlemen who, when they speak, are listened to. Let them carry the message of the Community Chest to the public. I believe you will agree with me that the process which I tried to outline contributes much to our community life. It is far more than merely a check on the validity of the agencies' requests. It keeps fundraising costs low; it makes for greater efficiency; it reduces irritation on the part of the givers; it helps to keep balance among the many types of social service agencies, and it has educational, social and spiritual values.

In Dallas we are convinced that the democratic way of life is the best of all. We are convinced that the quality of our democracy depends upon our standard of values. Through our work we dedicate ourselves to the finest and most precious aspects of our way of life. There is no question in our minds but that this program, hand in hand with the church, strengthens the foundations of the system of government under which we live.

BELLA S. ABZUG: REMARKS ON INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AID TRANSPORTATION FOR THE ELDERLY AND THE HANDICAPPED

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the elderly and the handicapped are often isolated

and unable to fully use services in their communities. Use of public transportation systems is often not possible for persons confined in wheelchairs or needing individual assistance due to their physical or emotional handicaps.

I am today introducing a bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act to enable the Secretary of Transportation to provide grants to nonprofit groups who are able to provide such transportation. These groups would be capable of transporting these people from their homes to hospitals, shopping centers, and recreational and cultural activities. Not only would this enable them to enrich their lives, but it would allow them to be independent and to do many of the things they were never able to do on their own.

This amendment would also raise the percentage of Urban Mass Transportation Act funds provided for meeting the special needs of the elderly and the handicapped from 1½ to 2 percent, which would increase the authorization for these purposes by \$15 million.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation is urgently needed, and I hope that it will receive the support it deserves. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The bill follows:

H.R. 10909

A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing transportation service meeting the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the grants and loans otherwise provided for under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make grants and loans—

"(1) to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof for the specific purpose of assisting them in providing mass transportation services which are planned, designed, and carried out so as to meet the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons, with such grants and loans being subject to all of the terms, conditions, requirements, and provisions applicable to grants and loans made under section 3(a) and being considered for the purposes of all other laws to have been made under such section; and

"(2) to private nonprofit corporations and associations for the specific purpose of assisting them in providing transportation services meeting the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons for whom mass transportation services planned, designed, and carried out under paragraph (1) are unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate, with such grants and loans being subject to such terms, conditions, requirements, and provisions (similar insofar as may be appropriate to those applicable to grants and loans under paragraph (1)) as the Secretary may determine to be necessary or appropriate for purposes of this paragraph.

Of the total amount of the obligations which the Secretary is authorized to incur on behalf of the United States under the first sentence of section 4(c), 2 per centum may be set aside and used exclusively to finance the programs and activities authorized by this subsection (including administrative costs)."

A SPECIAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE 23D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, because of the emergence of several very important issues facing the Nation, I have decided to send a special questionnaire to the people of the 23d Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The format of the questionnaire is as follows:

**QUESTIONNAIRE
THE LETTER**

DEAR FRIENDS: Congress has returned for the Fall Session to face new issues arising from President Nixon's dramatic decision to visit Peking, China, and his 90-day Freeze of Wages, Prices, and Rents.

Because of the importance of these actions I have issued this special Interim Questionnaire in order to obtain your views. For a prompt response I am utilizing for the first time a card form which can rapidly be counted by a computer.

Thanking you for your co-operation, I am
Sincerely yours,

ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

INSTRUCTIONS

In answering the questions below and on the reverse side, push out the appropriate box with a sharp pencil. Remove the punched tabs from back of the card, and mail to: Congressman Albert W. Johnson, 1424 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

STATISTICAL INFORMATION REQUESTED

Age: a. 18-21; b. 22-29; c. 30-45; d. 46-65; e. over 65.

Occupation: a. Wage Earner; b. Salaried Employee; c. Businessman; d. Professional; e. Farmer; f. Housewife; g. Retired; h. Other.

Voting Preference: a. Republican; b. Democrat; c. Independent.

THE QUESTIONS

1. Do you favor President Nixon's efforts in trying to establish friendlier relations with Mainland China?

2. Do you favor the President's proposed trip to Mainland China?

3. Would you favor the admission of Mainland China to the United Nations, provided Nationalist China retains its seat in the United Nations?

4. Would you favor the admission of Mainland China to the United Nations, even if the result is Nationalist China's withdrawal or removal from the United Nations?

5. Do you favor extension of the 90-day Price-Wage-Rent Freeze Order beyond November 13, 1971?

6. Do you favor a freeze on interest rates?

7. Do you favor a limit on profits?

8. Do you favor imposition of the 10% Import Tax?

9. Do you favor the repudiation of the promise to buy back U.S. dollars abroad with gold?

10. Do you favor the 10% tax credit for one year on the cost of new machinery and equipment to expand jobs and modernize U.S. plants?

11. Do you favor an Amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would require that no public school student shall because of his race, color, or creed be assigned to or required to attend a particular school?

The questionnaire also contains a picture of myself with the Capitol in the background.

I will be very much interested in the results of this survey, which will be tallied by a computer.

NEBRASKA'S SATURDAY AFTERNOONS

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, the weekly ratings of college football teams are available today and Nebraska's Cornhuskers not only continue as No. 1 in the Nation but dominate it as never before. In the United Press International rankings Nebraska received 33 of 35 first-place votes. Dick Cullum, columnist for the Minneapolis Tribune, recently paid tribute not just to the Nebraska team but to Nebraskans in general, writing:

Lincoln, Nebr., the Midlands of America, where the Big Eight teams play their football, is the last stand of Joe and Jane College. This is the land of the old culture and ideals, patriotism and honesty and such stuff."

The September 20, 1971, Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News, edited by Emil Reutzel, published an editorial quoting from Mr. Cullum's column and praising the Nebraska No. 1 spirit. Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

NEBRASKA'S SATURDAY AFTERNOONS

The enthusiasm of Nebraskans for the Cornhuskers has attracted nationwide interest. A recent Sports Illustrated article highlighted the Big Red phenomenon which only gained impetus with the No. 1 ranking among college teams and was not begun with that prestigious recognition.

We cannot testify that there is nothing like it elsewhere, but one who has is Dick Cullum, columnist for the Minneapolis Tribune. These were his words penned a week ago, before the Saturday contest which found Minnesota and Nebraska competing. They were partially reprinted in the Sports Den Saturday.

"Lincoln, Neb., the Midlands of America, where the Big Eight teams play their football, is the last stand of Joe and Jane College.

"There are huge college crowds in other areas, at Ohio State and Stanford and Louisiana State. But those have become more matter-of-fact in their attitudes toward the game. Each ticket holder acts his age. Even the students, whatever their emotions, don't get warmed up to the drama much before the kickoff.

"In the Midlands students aren't saying, 'After all, Dad, there are more important things than football.' Because, down here, there aren't.

"This is the land of the old culture and ideals, patriotism and honesty and such stuff.

"A native meeting guests at the airport while waiting for the Oregon team's plane to arrive says, 'Leave your typewriter there (on an unattended baggage claim area) and we'll pick it up on the way back.'

"Will it be safe?" the guest asks.

"Oh, sure. Why not?" the host replies; and it is.

"It is possible to tolerate this venture into the past for a little while, before returning to the realities of metropolitan living; but too much of it might leave one altogether behind the times."

Mr. Cullum's work is a little overdrawn, perhaps, but there is enough of the truth

in all of it to get the picture: There is a stadium where the football can still be returned after the extra-point kick and the drunks are hauled out without riots—if any appear in the first place; where a receiver can muffle the ball and not get booed; an opponent wins cheers for a good performance.

There are far more important things than football taking place in Lincoln, in Nebraska and all over the world on Saturday afternoon. But there is nothing wrong with the fact that on such afternoons they are momentarily forgotten.

CHOOSING A CANCER STRATEGY

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial which appeared yesterday in the Washington Star. Under the headline "Choosing a Cancer Strategy," the editorial sets forth a brief but well-thought-out synopsis of the current debate over the organizational details of the attack on cancer.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, it has been my privilege to participate in the hearings on "the strategy to be used in this scientific assault," as the editorial puts it. Chairman PAUL ROGERS deserves the gratitude and admiration of us all for the manner in which he has conducted the hearings and his insight into the significance of the debate.

The first element in a drive against cancer or any disease or problem, of course, is the will to commit manpower and material resources to the struggle. Unless an efficient organization is present, however, many of these precious resources will be wasted.

In addition, it must be kept in mind that cancer is not alone on the list of diseases which must be conquered. Efforts to find a cure for this killer must not be allowed to retard research in other fields.

For these reasons, the debate over the future position of the cancer-fighting agency takes on much more than technical significance. It is in this light that the editorial in the Star becomes a welcome addition to the dialog on the subject:

CHOOSING A CANCER STRATEGY

There is no doubt by now that the 92nd Congress will launch the costliest drive in history for the conquest of cancer. Everybody is pushing for it; the President and his natural opposition on the Hill are allied in this purpose. But there is one critical argument—about the strategy to be used in this scientific assault.

Representative Paul G. Rogers of Florida has, as we hoped he would, mounted a stiff challenge to the strategy approved by the Senate when it passed a hefty cancer-crusade bill in July. Rogers, who heads the House health subcommittee, served notice a few days ago that he will oppose the Senate's plan to substantially divorce a proposed new cancer-fighting agency from the National Institutes of Health.

Rather than do that, he insists, Congress should strengthen the National Cancer In-

stitute, a unit of the NIH which is presently the chief cancer research instrumentality. He has strong backing in this from professionals, some of whom are testifying in hearings now being held by the subcommittee. No convincing argument has been heard for detaching the cancer enterprise, and there are plenty of good reasons for leaving it with the NIH.

Under the Senate-passed bill, the new cancer agency would in some vague way be related to the NIH, while becoming independent and directly accountable to the President. As Rogers said bluntly in opening his hearings, the bill's language specifying an NIH connection "doesn't really mean anything." The cancer effort essentially would be on its own, competing with other disease programs, and separate heart, arthritis and other agencies probably would be demanded in short order if that happened. Such fragmentation can only weaken the NIH and defeat its concept of complementary research. Cancer scientists should have easy and constant access to basic research findings in other wings of the NIH. An interchange of discoveries between the institutes is essential.

The Senate plan for an independent approach is a cancer spectacular that would dazzle the public at the outset, but it also might impede rather than speed up the fight against the disease. The country has no need for a new cancer agency. It already has one of high repute that can be readily expanded, without damaging the National Institutes' well-integrated research system.

While the Senate-passed bill has administration support, there may be room for compromise on the organizational aspects. HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson defended the separate-agency idea before Rogers' subcommittee last week but said he would "not want to be in the area of foreclosing anything" the panel might recommend. There is hope, if Rogers and other like-minded representatives persist, that the cancer program will be firmly attached to the NIH when it finally emerges, and that a painful mistake will have been prevented.

THE PROPOSED INDIAN PEAKS WILDERNESS

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess, it was my privilege to spend time in the Arapaho National Forest in Colorado.

The Indian Peaks area is located within the Arapaho National Forest and I believe the peace and tranquillity of its undisturbed splendor should be preserved in our national wilderness preservation system.

I submit for the reading of my colleagues an article from the July issue of Colorado magazine describing this unusually beautiful area.

A bill has been introduced by Congressmen BROTZMAN and McKEVITT which would instruct the Secretary of Agriculture to review this area to determine its suitability for incorporation in the wilderness system.

After reading the article describing this area, I am hopeful a majority of my colleagues will join me in favoring passage of this legislation.

INDIAN PEAKS—BACKPACKERS HAPPY GROUND
 Apache, Arapaho, Pawnee, Kiowa, Paiute, Navajo, Shoshone—the mountains tower as proud and as wild as the Indian tribes whose name they bear. These are the granite chieftains in a land whose lofty scenery and outstanding recreational values have aroused a public clamor for its inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The Indian Peaks are 75,000 acres of high-country splendor—a scant 60 miles from Denver, and almost on Boulder's back doorstep. Here unusually steep mountains rise sharply to 13,500 feet and beneath these spires lies a wonderland of fragile Alpine tundra, turquoise lakes, rushing streams and dense forests. Here, too, is the largest concentration of glaciers in all of Colorado—a total of 10.

More than 40 of the lakes yield treasures of native, brook, rainbow and brown trout and are connected by a 100-mile network of hiking and horseback trails. These routes are readily reached from seven major access points and form an intriguing network of loops which weave back and forth across the Continental Divide over four scenic timberline passes.

For more than 40 years the US Forest Service has actually managed Indian Peaks like a true wilderness. No roads penetrate the area and other signs of human encroachment are nil. And yet this natural wonderland exists without official status or any guaranteed permanent protection. Miners, lumbermen and other commercial interests lurk hungrily for a chance to place a despoiling foot in the door. And a prominent State senator argues loudly for a highway which would slice the very heart out of the area.

Sixteen miles long and averaging nine miles in width, Indian Peaks straddles the Continental Divide from the southern boundary of Rocky Mountain National Park on the north to Rollins Pass on the south. Its location places it at the hub of an area of intense recreation pressure from the nearly 1,500,000 people compacted between Denver and Fort Collins.

Each weekend thousands of people whose interests run the gamut of outdoor activities stream westward out of Denver in search of just such a mountain sanctuary. This crush of humanity has already wreaked havoc upon public lands along the Front Range from Pikes Peak to the Wyoming line. Campgrounds are crowded; roadways are clogged with vehicles and a mass of litter trails in the wake.

The impact of this pressure has been keenly felt by other readily accessible wild areas. The Rawah Wilderness west of Fort Collins has long shown the wear and tear of excessive use, and now the Gore Range-Eagles Nest Primitive Area northwest of Dillon has begun to buckle under the strain. Great scars have appeared on the soil and vegetation around the high mountain lakes. Trails are eroding from overuse and the blackened remains from thousands of campfires pock the land. Already forest rangers have begun to speak of a permit system to limit access, or at least to spread the visitations over a wider area.

Concerned outdoorsmen feel that Indian Peaks must be given permanent official designation to help distribute Colorado's spiraling demands for recreation.

For this very reason, there is a flurry of Congressional activity to give Indian Peaks the same protective status of other wild areas with which it has so much in common.

On March 11, 1971, Colorado Representatives Donald Brozman and Mike McKevitt introduced in the House of Representatives a bill which instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to review Indian Peaks as to its suitability for preservation as Wilderness. An identical measure was given the Senate by Colorado Senators Gordon Allott and Peter Dominick.

Should Congress approve the measure, the Agriculture Department would, through the administrative arm of the U.S. Forest Service, initiate a study to define the wilderness potential of Indian Peaks. Such a study would set the stage for possible official Wilderness designation in the future.

The Brozman bill specifies a 75,000-acre Indian Peaks Wilderness—a substantial increase over the 55,000 acres presently included in the Forest Service management area.

The difference suggests a debate similar to the Eagles Nest Wilderness hearings held in 1970. Both sides agreed on the basic wilderness character of the central area and the need to preserve it. The clash came over which parts of the fringe to include.

With Indian Peaks the argument arises over a sizable 15,000-acre parcel on both sides of the Divide south of Arapaho Pass, and many minor boundary variations along the edges.

The larger area contains many small pockets of privately-owned land. The Forest Service prefers simply to exclude these. But many conservationists—including Brozman—feel such scenic and undeveloped private holdings should be part of any future wilderness.

One gets the impression, however, that the Forest Service will quarrel much less over this major addition than over lesser boundary variations.

"We believe boundaries have to be defensible," says Don Biddison, supervisor of the Arapaho National Forest where two-thirds of the present 55,000 acres lie. The remainder, on the east side of the Continental Divide, is in the Roosevelt National Forest. "A Wilderness boundary must have some geographic base—a ridge, a stream or the like—so there is no doubt where it lies," Biddison continues, implying that the conservationists are trying to squeeze undefinable borderlands into the wilderness.

In truth, there would not be even the opportunity for debate were it not for the foresight and diligence of the Forest Service over the past four decades. In 1927, famed Denver conservationist Arthur Carhart, then a Forest Service landscape engineer, took a special liking to Indian Peaks.

"One morning just at daybreak," Carhart recalls, "I emerged from my tent atop one of the many ridges. I watched in awe as the dawn glow swept over the plains; the entire land seemed to come alive in one great burst of light. Then, turning around, I discovered everything west of the mountains still in total darkness. It was as if some magic veil had been drawn across the world, and it was one of the most awe-inspiring sights of my life."

Soon Carhart proposed a special Indian Peaks management area of 47,000 acres to be established under administrative order, and not long thereafter, Forest Ranger D. O. Johnson took over. From 1930 to 1937, he directed much of the work on the fine hiking trails which now crisscross Indian Peaks.

Johnson also is responsible for getting thousands of sheep out of the area during that period. "I got a good chewing from the assistant regional forester for doing it," he recently laughed, "but these dang sheep never should have been up in that country to begin with."

Finally in 1965, Indian Peaks was expanded to its present 55,000-acre size. More important, the 1965 decree closed the entire area to motorized travel of any kind, a move which further enhances its primitive character and the hope of official Wilderness status.

The Forest Service is proud of its record in Indian Peaks and sees no reason why it should not simply go on managing the area just as it has.

"Even if Indian Peaks were declared a Wilderness overnight, there would be no significant change in its management," Biddison

asserts. "I really don't see why the area has to be designated. People have been receiving a wilderness experience here for years."

Wilderness advocates do not doubt the Forest Service's sincerity in maintaining Indian Peaks, but are quick to point out that outside pressures often have a way of upsetting even the best intentions.

A classic example is the on-again, off-again proposal for a trans-mountain highway linking Grand County and Middle Park with Boulder and the East Slope. One of the most touted plans would send the highway up out of Boulder to a tunnel under the Continental Divide at 11,906-foot Arapaho Pass. This route would then wind down Arapaho Creek on the West Slope, past Monarch Lake and on into Granby. To build such a roadway would carve the heart out of some of the very best wilderness. Biddison terms the prospect of a road gouged down Arapaho Creek as "unthinkable."

Yet the road has a powerful proponent in Fay DeBerard of Kremmling, President Pro Tem of the Colorado Senate. DeBerard's maneuverings on behalf of the highway typify political pressure that can swarm around a potential wilderness. Moreover, they also amply demonstrate how public funds can be squandered on something the people probably don't want in the first place.

In early 1970 DeBerard rammed a resolution on his highway through the Senate. It called for a feasibility study of the Arapaho Pass route—at a cost of \$50,000. The well-known Chicago firm of DeLeuw, Cather and Company was commissioned to do the job.

Nothing more was heard about the route until the consultants submitted their findings. Two facts stood out: 1) the road would cost a whopping \$181.7 million to build, and 2) another route along the northern rim of Rocky Mountain National Park was by far the best for the northern Colorado highway.

DeBerard was incensed and promptly moved to discredit the report. He charged that DeLeuw, Cather and Company knew nothing about mountain highways in the first place. He budgeted little on his proposed route through Indian Peaks. In the midst of this furor, it was also revealed that the cost of the study had ballooned astronomically to \$170,000—to which one official sighed "money down the drain."

The highway proposal presently lies dormant but conservationists are only too aware that such matters have a way of reviving themselves at the behest of certain powerful and persuasive politicians. They'd like to see the area made an official Wilderness before something like "DeBerard's Folly" comes along to spoil it.

THE GROWING RUSSIAN NAVAL THREAT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, most Americans still live under the assumption that theirs is the most powerful navy in the world. Many remember the text book descriptions of the United States as a sea power and the Soviet Union as a land power, and many are slow to change these old assumptions, once true but to our great peril, true no longer.

In recent years the Soviet Navy has expanded dramatically. Today it approaches a position of dominance in the Indian Ocean and in the Mediterranean

Sea. The Soviet base in the North Atlantic, at Murmansk, is the largest of all Russian naval bases. Early in July, a fleet of Soviet, East German, and Polish warships maneuvered in the Skagerrak, the waterway linking the North and Baltic Seas. Norwegians and Danes watched from the shore, and at the same time a much larger Soviet fleet—guided missile cruisers and destroyers, submarines and bombers—fought a simulated battle against a NATO fleet. After that, troops from 31 amphibious ships swarmed ashore. The landing was on Russian soil but within easy eyesight of watchers at Norway's northern tip. Simultaneous Soviet naval maneuvers along Norway's southern and northern approaches also worry NATO officers.

Our allies in the North Atlantic are expressing increasing alarm at Soviet growth and strength in that area. The Danish newspaper, *Kristeligt Dagblad*, recently featured a headline, "Norwegians Fear the Russian's Northern Fleet." It noted that Murmansk has become the largest naval base in the world, with 15 new submarines with 16 atomic rockets. Murmansk is now one of four major Soviet naval bases, and is the largest. On the Kola Peninsula there are almost 50 airports and landing stations. Since World War II, the population has grown from 290,000 to 800,000 and Murmansk has become a big city. This is all due to naval activity.

In an important interview in the September 13, 1971, issue of *U.S. News & World Report*, Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, stated:

The Soviet navy is dramatically more powerful than it was 10 years ago . . . if the United States continues to reduce and the Soviet Union continues to increase, it's got to be inevitable that the day will come when the result will go against the U.S.

Asked if the Soviet Navy outguns the U.S. Navy, except for carrier-based aircraft, Admiral Zumwalt noted:

If the United States today suddenly de-commissioned all of its aircraft carriers, we would lack any capability whatsoever to control and use the seas.

Admiral Zumwalt also pointed out that—

They have 3 times the number of submarines that we do, and they are building at roughly 2½ times the rate we're building.

Arguing against the facts that our Navy is adequate to meet our defense needs, the Congress reduced the Navy budget submitted by the President by \$2 billion in 1971. Admiral Zumwalt said:

That represented a serious setback in our capability. There are indications that the Congress will reduce the President's budget in 1972. If that happens, then once again our capability will take a further reduction.

All those who naively believe that our present defense capacity and rate of growth is adequate for the Nation's defense needs should read with care the words of Admiral Zumwalt.

I wish to share this interview with my colleagues, and include it in the *RECORD* at this time:

WHERE RUSSIAN THREAT KEEPS GROWING: INTERVIEW WITH ADM. ELMO R. ZUMWALT, JR., U.S. CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Q. Admiral Zumwalt, what shape is the U.S. Navy in?

A. There are pluses and minuses.

With regard to personnel, we are generally better off from a quality standpoint. Our re-enlistment rates have improved. However, we're not as strong in numbers because we've been required to make major reductions in personnel—down from 692,435 officers and men a year ago to 622,500 now.

Nor are we as strong from the standpoint of ships, because we have also made major reductions there as well. Whereas we had 769 naval ships a year ago, we are down to 700 today. We also have 770 fewer aircraft than a year ago.

So we have gained qualitatively with regard to people; lost quantitatively with regard to people, ships and aircraft.

Q. Has this been because of the cost of the Vietnam war?

A. The effect of the Vietnam war has been, in essence, to cost us the equivalent of about a generation of shipbuilding. What increases there were in Navy budgets have been spent largely on attrition aircraft, bombs, bullets and increased operating expenses.

If you look at the years 1962 through 1972, in its shipbuilding appropriations the Navy was down to less than a billion dollars per year at a time when we should have been spending 3 billion dollars a year on new ships. We need that much if we are to replace our 75-billion-dollar plant every 25 years.

Q. Compared with 10 years ago, is the Navy a stronger or a weaker force?

A. Weaker in some categories and stronger in others.

With regard to the submarine force, the Navy is stronger than it was 10 years ago because we've been able to continue our nuclear-construction program, using nuclear submarines to replace the much less capable diesel submarines.

On the other hand, the number of aircraft carriers has been dramatically reduced, and this has meant major reduction in our strength. We are down from 24 to 16 carriers.

The number of escorts has been dramatically reduced. And although there have been qualitative improvements as new ships have been built, the improved quality has not been adequate to make up for the reduction in numbers that we've lost.

Q. Against that background, Admiral, what has happened to the Navy's responsibilities worldwide? Have they tended to shrink in this period?

A. No. In my judgment, the Navy's responsibilities are greater than they've ever been before. We've always been the nation's first line of defense.

You will recall that during the Korean War it was the Navy carrier air support that made it possible for us to hang on to the Pusan perimeter as our bases were overrun in South Korea, and it was the Navy-Marine Corps amphibious landing at Inchon that outflanked the North Koreans and drove them out of the South Korean Peninsula.

During the Southeast Asia war, naval carriers carried the large fraction of the action while we were building our air bases ashore in the first year.

At the present time, under the Nixon Doctrine it is clear that the high-technology services—air and naval power—are going to be required increasingly to come to the support of indigenous armies of our allies. I would have to say that the Navy's mission is greater than it has been in the past, as I understand the Nixon Doctrine.

Q. Does the Soviet Navy worry you?

A. The Soviet Navy is dramatically more powerful than it was 10 years ago. You can trace, almost to the moment, the point at

which the Soviets began their tremendous construction program in two fields: one to achieve strategic nuclear parity, and the other to achieve a strong naval capability with the results of the lessons they learned in the Cuban missile crisis.

In the ensuing years since the Cuban missile crisis, they have devoted a tremendous amount of their resources to the acquisition of a submarine fleet which outnumbers ours by 3 to 1 and which is outbuilding us at an appreciable annual rate. They have acquired air power increasingly capable of coming to grips with ships at sea because they are increasingly picking up airfields around the Eurasian littoral. They have built surface ships that have been optimized with the surface-to-surface missile against our surface ships.

Q. If there were a showdown with the Soviet Navy at sea, what would be your prediction as to the outcome?

A. This is, of course, a very speculative question, but I think that no matter who does the analysis he would conclude that if the U.S. continues to reduce and the Soviet Union continues to increase, it's got to be inevitable that the day will come when the result will go against the U.S.

Mr. Nixon pointed out in a press conference on July 30, 1970, a point that I think is most perceptive about sea power, and that is the dramatic difference between what the Soviets need—as basically a land power—and what we need—as basically a maritime power.

Their vital interests require a large Army and Air Force to protect the Eurasian heartland. Our vital interests require a capability to control and use the seas to hold together the maritime alliance of which we're a part.

The Soviets don't need a Navy superior to ours to protect their vital interests. They only can aspire to have a Navy larger than ours for purposes of interfering with our vital interests.

Q. Is the Soviet Union doing well in the Mediterranean—challenging our superiority?

A. Yes. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union has just recently—on May 27, 1971—negotiated, probably for some very suitable price, a 15-year treaty of friendship and co-operation that may well assure their continued use of Egyptian naval and air bases in the United Arab Republic. They may not be successful in communizing the Government of the U.A.R., but they have been successful in achieving a very firm geopolitical position.

Q. We keep hearing that the Soviets want to drive east of Suez into the Indian Ocean, an area the U.S. has stayed pretty clear of. Is that your appraisal?

A. Yes. It's exactly what I would be doing if I were running the Soviet empire and if I had the same ideology that they have. They have several goals in going into the Indian Ocean:

In the first place, the presence of their ships there in much larger numbers than ours gives them the same opportunity to convert this presence, coupled with an aggressive foreign policy, into the acquisition of port capabilities that they've been able to achieve in the Mediterranean and in the Red Sea.

Second, it helps them complete the encirclement of Communist China, which I'm sure is a national objective of theirs.

Q. Would opening the Suez Canal help that purpose?

A. Definitely. It would bring their Black Sea Fleet many thousands of miles closer to its home ports.

Q. Wouldn't use of the Suez Canal bring the Indian Ocean closer for the U.S. fleet, too?

A. The figures are roughly 9,000 miles closer for the Soviets and roughly 2,000 miles closer for us. That would be the case

if one believes that we could get through the Suez Canal in times of crisis. I'm not sure that we could.

Q. Is it also true that some U.S. aircraft carriers are too big to go through the Suez Canal?

A. That's also correct.

Q. There are reports that, as the Vietnam war winds down, some of our Pacific Fleet may go into the Indian Ocean. Is this likely?

A. This is a political judgment that has to be made—and hasn't yet been made. U.S. naval ships are able to go anywhere any time.

Q. What do you have in the Indian Ocean area now?

A. We have maintained a World War II seaplane tender and two World War II destroyers there for a number of years.

The Soviets have come from a presence much less than that to maintenance, on the average, of eight to nine ships at any one time in the Indian Ocean.

Q. What kind of new base are you building on the atoll of Diego Garcia, south of India?

A. A very austere communications facility. Q. Could it be developed into something more substantial if the decision were made?

A. There are no plans to do so.

Q. When you talk about the presence of our fleet and their fleet in the Indian Ocean, what do these ships do—call at ports and generally show the flag, or sail around in maneuvers?

A. They do both. It's the visible presence of naval power that has such tremendous impact on littoral nations.

For example, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations on the southern flank of Europe all unanimously feel that the presence of the U.S. Sixth Fleet is their guarantor against encroachment by the Soviet Union, and that's why it's so desperately important for this country to maintain sufficient naval strength to keep our commitments in the Sixth Fleet—and also in the Seventh Fleet in the Western Pacific.

Q. In this regard, it is said that if a situation similar to the 1958 Lebanon crisis recurred, the U.S. Sixth Fleet would not be able to act as forcefully now as it did at that time because of the presence of the Soviets in the Mediterranean. Do you agree with that?

A. No. You will recall that during the Jordanian crisis last year President Nixon made the decision to reinforce the Sixth Fleet with a third carrier task force, and the U.S.S. *Guam* embarked Marines—and the crisis abruptly abated.

There were, of course, other things that happened at the same time that made a contribution, but it's clear to me that, as the President stated on Sept. 29, 1970, "the power and the mobility, the readiness of the Sixth Fleet in this period was absolutely indispensable in keeping the peace in the Mediterranean."

This was one of those cases where the capability of the United States to deploy naval and Marine power on the international seas, without having to obtain base rights from anybody, made the difference.

Q. Admiral, getting back to relative strengths, is it true that the Soviet Navy outguns the U.S. Navy, except for carrier-based aircraft?

A. Let me answer this way:

If the United States today suddenly decommissioned all of its aircraft carriers, we would lack any capability whatsoever to control and use the seas. We have a very, very capable weapons system in the aircraft carrier—particularly in the nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier with its ability to maintain very high speeds at all times and to be constantly ready—100 per cent ready—to go the minute the decision is made and with the capability to outrange the surface-to-surface missile of the Soviet ships.

Q. Of the 16 U.S. carriers in commission, how many are nuclear-powered?

A. We have one operating, two building. We badly need a fourth. We're going to be making the most vigorous possible case for it. It's obvious the decision rests on higher authority both in the executive branch and within the Congress.

Q. Do you have enough escort ships capable of keeping pace with these nuclear carriers?

A. We need more escort ships as well.

Q. Do you have any interest in using helicopter carriers, the way the Soviet Union does?

A. We're in the process of designing at present a sea-control ship—a ship that will be in the 12,000- to 20,000-ton range and will carry helicopters and vertical-takeoff-and-landing aircraft.

These can in no way be considered a substitute for aircraft carriers. They will have a very limited—practically zero—capability to project our power inland, as our carriers have had to do to save us in Korea and Southeast Asia. But they will make a significant contribution to the protection of convoys and of task forces which are confined to a given geographical area—by defending against both the submarine and the aircraft, and the missile coming from either that aircraft or that submarine.

Q. Is it possible that weapons are coming along that will make the carrier much more vulnerable than it is now?

A. One of the most overstated claims, in my judgment, is the vulnerability of the carrier. None of the oldest class of carriers which we have remaining in the fleet today—the *Essex*-class carriers which were in World War II—was ever sunk.

Many of them took as many as five or six hits by the first guided missile in history—the Japanese kamikaze aircraft—carrying payloads equivalent to the warheads of the current surface-to-surface missiles. And many of them took several torpedo hits. In every case, within a relatively short period, they were back in action—frequently an hour later. When the time came, they went back to port for repairs.

Since that time, the modern class of carriers, all but three of which are of postwar construction, has been given much more protection—heavier armor, more compartmentation, much better damage control—so that, although our carriers will take hits, they will have a very high degree of survivability.

The nuclear carrier *Enterprise* suffered a fire, you will recall, and nine 1,000-pound bombs exploded. Had the *Enterprise* needed, she could have been back in action within a couple of hours.

Q. A new nuclear carrier is priced at 800 million dollars. How do you justify spending that much for one ship?

A. One has to ask oneself how much we have spent for the privilege of having the equivalent of the aircraft carrier—that is, a land-based airfield—in an overseas area where we need it.

For example, Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya had a relatively brief lifetime before the U.S. was asked to leave, and yet the costs for that airfield during its lifetime were probably very comparable to the cost of a nuclear aircraft carrier for its 40-year life cycle.

Furthermore, that aircraft carrier has the capability to be anywhere in the world as the geopolitical situation changes, and not just in one portion of the African desert.

As we consciously shift to a posture in which we expect our allies to provide their own indigenous capability, the best way to have the assets rapidly capable of concentration to support one particular ally which may be beleaguered is to have your airfields seaborne.

Q. Do most members of Congress share this feeling?

A. No. There are many who do, but many are not convinced.

I think the thing the Navy has to do is to continue to make the case. The facts clearly speak for themselves. In the Jordanian crisis, as an example, the only airfields capable of being used were those airfields at sea—the carriers.

Could I take two or three minutes to deal further with this? I think it is important to look at the capabilities that the Navy has.

The first capability is our contribution to the strategic nuclear deterrent of the nation. In the past this has been the Polaris-missile-carrying submarine. It is being converted now to Poseidon, which will give us an invulnerable component of the over-all deterrent through the '70s, and we are designing a follow-on system for the '80s. Increasingly in the future, we are going to have to rely on our sea-based systems.

We then have conventional roles which we carry out. One is our peacetime overseas presence—the kind of thing we have been talking about: sea control and the projection of power overseas.

We control the seas with our aircraft carriers, capable of sinking surface ships, surfaced submarines, shooting down aircraft and, with our F-14 aircraft, shooting down the missiles from any one of those enemy sources. We use our killer submarines, our attack submarines, our destroyers.

We project our power also with the aircraft from our carriers capable of projecting 600 and 700 miles inland, with our Marines capable of being projected from our amphibious force, and with our merchant marine, which in Southeast Asia had to carry 96 per cent of the millions of tons required to support ourselves and our allies and which, even after the completion of the purchase of the very fine C-5A aircraft, will be required to carry 94 per cent of the logistics to go on the surface of the seas. Even the aviation gas to get that C-5A aircraft home so that it can carry a usable load overseas has to go in surface ships.

Q. Admiral, if the aircraft carrier is so important, why don't the Soviets have any?

A. The Soviets started out way behind. Their first priority was to scramble frantically to get a capability to deal with our superior Navy. That meant building submarines, and it meant building surface ships which would be expendable but capable of firing a surface-to-surface missile in a first strike against our carriers—hopefully to create enough damage that they could try to come in and finish up with submarines and aircraft.

We are doing a number of things to negate this—a whole host of things such as our own surface-to-surface missile. We're working hard on antimissile defense, and of course our carriers have a very high degree of invulnerability.

Q. Is the biggest threat still the Soviet submarines?

A. Yes, because they have 3 times the number of submarines that we do, and they are building at roughly 2½ times the rate we're building.

Q. What progress has been made in anti-submarine defenses?

A. We continue to improve our techniques. In my judgment, we know everything that we need to know in order to deal with the threat. Our problem is to retain adequate forces to deal with it.

We have the antisubmarine aircraft—the aircraft operating from land bases, the anti-submarine aircraft operating from our aircraft carriers—we have the antisubmarine escorts, we have our attack submarines, all of which are capable collectively of dealing with this threat if we are permitted to retain adequate numbers.

Q. Are you going to have adequate numbers

under the budget that you now are preparing?

A. The Congress reduced the Navy budget submitted by the President by 2 billion dollars in 1971. That represented a serious setback in our capability.

There are indications that the Congress will reduce the President's budget in 1972. If that happens, then once again our capability will take a further reduction. I don't know the size of the cut, so I can't judge how much capability addition we will lose.

Q. Does the advent of the Soviet nuclear-submarine force make the defense problem vastly more difficult?

A. Yes. They are faster, they're capable of remaining submerged for longer periods of time, and they are therefore more of a threat than the diesel submarines.

Q. Does that suggest that we might be losing ground?

A. The question has to be answered in two frames of reference: We have made the qualitative progress, and we have the know-how. The question is whether or not we will be permitted to retain the force levels necessary to do the job—and that is a question that I can't answer.

Q. Talking about know-how, are you satisfied with the Navy's research programs?

A. I am. We need to continue always a vigorous research-and-development program in order to stay ahead, because the Soviets are always making improvements in their submarine capabilities. But qualitatively I am satisfied with our present superiority. If we had the force levels to go with it we would have no problem.

Q. A couple of ideas have been talked about recently: first, putting the land-based Minuteman missile at sea and, second, possibly sending our antiballistic missiles to sea to make them less vulnerable to a surprise attack. Do you see any virtue in either of these ideas?

A. Both of these ideas get into the field of strategic nuclear balance, and that is something that is currently under negotiation in the strategic-arms-limitation talks with the Soviets. I think it would be preferable for me not to discuss that.

Q. Is there an official policy against your talking about strategic systems?

A. None other than the obvious fact that when you have diplomatic negotiations going on, the better part of valor for a military man is to keep his mouth shut.

TRAWLERS THAT NET INTELLIGENCE

Q. Admiral, what do you think about these Soviet trawlers operating off our coasts?

A. They are there to collect all kinds of intelligence—everything from the most sophisticated kind of electronics intelligence to picking up debris dropped over the side of our ships.

Q. What do you mean by "electronics intelligence"?

A. They record everything that they can hear in the electromagnetic spectrum—that is, our radars, radios and so forth. They're interested in getting information on everything we have in our order of battle ashore and at sea and in the air: what kinds of radios we use, what kinds of frequencies; what kinds of radars we use, what their frequencies are—things of that nature.

Q. Has the Navy been keeping a pretty close watch on the possibility that the Soviets may still try to build a submarine base in Cuba? And why did they try to build one in the first place?

A. We keep a constantly close eye on it. What the Soviets would have gained had they achieved a base in Cuba is a capability to maintain about one third more missile submarines on station than they are now able to maintain.

They also would have violated the agreements originally arrived at between Chairman Khrushchev and President Kennedy at

the time of the Cuban missile crisis. And, therefore, I think President Nixon took a very important and bold and courageous step in insuring that these understandings were not violated.

Q. Are you sure that the Soviet Union in fact doesn't have a submarine base in Cuba?

A. Quite sure.

Q. Do you keep close track of the number of Soviet subs in the Gulf of Mexico or off our other coasts?

A. I think I should limit myself to the statement that we do know that they are there—that the Soviets do maintain missile submarines off our coasts.

Q. Are they increasing the number of missile submarines off our coasts?

A. They obviously have, since they used to have none and now they have some.

They are also building the new *Yankee* class at a fantastic rate.

Q. If a Soviet submarine were to fire a missile from 100 miles offshore in the Atlantic toward Washington, D.C., would there be any defense against that kind of attack?

A. Yes. The best defense is to have your own missiles at sea where they can't be damaged by such an attack. I'm speaking about the threat of retaliation. In my judgment, it is the very best answer we have.

Q. Do you mean that antisubmarine-warfare devices won't really protect you 100 per cent of the time?

A. No—because it takes time to sink submarines, and it takes only a very few seconds to get missiles off. Therefore, if an enemy nation decides to strike first it is going to be able to get its missiles off before you're able to move in for an antisubmarine kill.

Q. On another subject, Admiral: If we go to an all-volunteer military service, is this going to affect the kind of recruiting you've been able to do? Can the Navy maintain the kind of qualitative improvement you talked about if there's no draft to encourage men to enlist?

A. First, it's absolutely clear that we had to have a two-year draft extension. There was zero prospect of achieving an all-volunteer force while continuing to fight the South Vietnam war with the large number of men required at its peak.

Second, having gotten the extension, all of the service chiefs must do their very best to try to achieve the capability to get nothing but volunteers by 1973. We all know that the three services that are all-volunteer at the present time—Navy, Marines and Air Force—are only all-volunteer because there is a draft.

Third, I'm not able to perceive how rapidly the country will recover from its typical, cyclical postwar syndrome which involves a considerable number of our people having a rather negative image of the military. And unless that is corrected there will be lots of disinclination for the young man to volunteer to join the military force. He's got to feel that it's an honorable, worthwhile profession.

Fourth, I don't know whether or not the pay scales will have been made adequate by that time.

Q. Doesn't the pay-scale increase in the proposed extension of the Selective Service Act seem to be a fairly healthy one?

A. The pay increase is very heavily oriented to attracting the new man—and hasn't yet made a significant increase in the pay of the man who has finished his first tour and is considering whether or not to re-enlist.

Q. Can you give us any idea of how many men do reenlist after completing one tour?

A. During the last six months of calendar 1969 it was 9.5 per cent. During the last six months of calendar 1970 it was up to 16 per cent. In February and March of this year it was 20 or 21 per cent. We need 35 per cent.

Q. How do you account for the increases so far?

A. I think it's a combination of factors: continuing emphasis on the need to improve conditions of life, begun by my predecessor and continued by me—both of us working for a Secretary of the Navy who is very interested in this field; in part the result of the economic downturn, and in part the result of the fact that there is a certain percentage of men who, when their country gets into the kind of trouble we're in, are patriotic enough to decide, "By golly, I'm going to give it another go!"

Q. Are you getting those higher retention rates in the highly skilled ratings that you need?

A. No—that's one of our problems. We're doing better the less-skilled ratings and not as well in the ratings involving much more technical education because those young men obviously can draw much higher salaries on the outside, and it's more difficult to compete with civilian industry. This is true of all the services.

Q. What about the officer corps?

A. In the officer corps we have three primary categories in the line—submariners, aviators and surface officers.

The retention of submarine officers has been improving as a result of some improvements in the conditions of their detailing and as a result of a bonus we're now able to pay nuclear submariners as a result of legislation passed a year or so ago.

In the case of our aviation officers, retention rates are also improving.

As for the surface officer, the retention rates are not improving. These are the officers who take the largest impact from the continuing long deployments of our surface ships in foreign waters.

PEACE BY MILITARY STRENGTH

Q. You spoke a moment ago about a "post-war syndrome" as a matter of concern. Would you elaborate on that?

A. I think there is a significant minority who feels that the military services and military personnel are simply no longer relevant in the modern world.

Fortunately, I believe that a respectable majority still continues to understand that, as the President has suggested, you can only have a generation of peace by maintaining the necessary military strength.

Q. Is this minority feeling gaining ground?

A. We have been going through a period when it has been spreading. I'm not able to perceive when the pendulum will swing back.

We do know that historically we've gone through this kind of period after each war. Vietnam is now the longest and most unpopular war in our history. It may take a little longer for the pendulum to swing, but I believe that it clearly will, given the tremendous efforts that the President and the Secretary of Defense are making to insure that the people understand, and given the fact that if we continue to weaken ourselves it will be quite obvious from the way in which the world community begins to destabilize that we must do more to maintain our military strength.

Q. Admiral, as your fleet goes down in size can you reduce your shore establishment and save money which you could put into new weapons systems?

A. Yes, we could and should reduce our shore establishment as our fleet comes down in size. We cannot, however, save great amounts. One of the problems is that in the first year you save almost nothing because there are significant closing costs. But I would say, as a crystal-ball guess, that if we were able to close all those bases that we ought to close, we could save something on the order of a quarter of a billion dollars per year.

WE NOW EXPECT MORE FROM ALLIES

Q. Does the Nixon Doctrine hold out some substantial hope of being able to abandon

some of your bases in the Far East, for example? Could you scrap them all and move back to Pearl Harbor?

A. I would hope that the day would never come when the United States is forced to fall back to Pearl. You remember that's where we started when we had to begin the long, costly fight all the way back across the Western Pacific after the attack against us at Pearl Harbor.

The forward basing that we now have is going to change somewhat in concept. That is, under the Nixon Doctrine we've come to expect much more from our allies' contributing to their own strength.

But we are always going to want bases in some areas overseas as a substitute for a much larger and more expensive number of forces that we would have to maintain in order to keep our ships supplied, and so forth.

Q. So you're not seriously thinking of falling back over the next three to five years?

A. No. As far as the Navy is concerned, I believe we're going to want to maintain bases in most of the countries where we're now based. There will be some retrenchments, but none of major proportions.

Q. Several years ago there was talk of building some fairly large bases in Australia. Has this gone by the board?

A. There's nothing currently on the horizon with regard to the Australians. The Australians are doing some base improvements on their own.

Q. Some Australians talk about an alliance—a naval grouping of Japan, Indonesia, Australia—to protect trade routes through the Malacca Strait into the Indian Ocean. Is that at all feasible?

A. Under the Nixon Doctrine we will make every use of Allied forces that are available in any kind of a crisis situation.

If, for example, there were a crisis involving, say, the Indonesian area and if the President determined that our national interest required it, or the Indonesians felt threatened and joined with us in management of that crisis, certainly any forces they had would be welcomed.

We have treaty commitments with the Japanese and with the Australians, and the President has stated that treaty commitments would be honored.

Q. Are you happy about the pace at which the Japanese are picking up their naval defenses?

A. I think the Japanese Navy has made significant progress. They started from a very, very low figure, as you know. I would hope to see them do more in the years ahead.

Q. One final question: Is it not a fact, Admiral, that the Russian Navy has not been tested in battle since the Russo-Japanese War almost 70 years ago?

A. Not quite a fact. The Russian Navy had some engagements in World War I and in World War II. They did a relatively pitiful job.

They have certainly demonstrated a much greater degree of professionalism in the last quarter of a century, and a very rapidly increasing degree of professionalism in the last 10 years.

I consider them a first-class professional outfit.

PANAMA CANAL: STATE DEPARTMENT DISHONESTY EXPOSED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly vital issues now before the Congress

is the future of the Panama Canal—its sovereign control and its major modernization. Panamanian efforts to gain control of this strategic waterway apparently encouraged by certain elements in our Government has placed U.S. control of the canal in such peril as to arouse the people of our country despite the silence of the mass news media; and they have flooded the Congress with protest against the projected giveaway at Panama.

Fortunately, this Nation does have publicists of outstanding ability and independence who cannot be cowed. Among them is Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, an experienced officer of the U.S. Army formerly on the staff of General MacArthur and an author of distinction.

In a recent column he analyzes a State Department memorandum on the current Panama treaty negotiations with a refreshing degree of forthrightness. His comments are so pertinent and timely that I quote them as part of my remarks and urge that it be read by all Members of the Congress:

NIXON TAKES WRONG TACK IN PANAMA

WASHINGTON.—I have before me a Department of State memorandum on Panama Canal Treaty negotiations which illustrates the sorry quality of U.S. diplomacy in this Nixon era.

This memorandum states that "The basic U.S. treaty objectives established by President Johnson in 1964 and supported by Presidents Hoover, Truman and Eisenhower were to maintain U.S. control and defense of a canal in Panama while removing to the maximum extent possible all other causes of friction between the two countries." That statement is dishonest. It represents the Johnson policy as a continuation of the policies of his predecessors when it is in fact an historic reversal of their policies.

Presidents Hoover, Truman and Eisenhower were adamant about maintaining U.S. sovereignty in the Canal Zone. The sovereign may grant concessions and he may abolish concessions; but when he gives up sovereignty, he surrenders all final authority, submitting himself to the new sovereign.

President Johnson said in 1964, "Today we have informed the Government of Panama that we are ready to negotiate a new treaty. . . . It should recognize the sovereignty of Panama. . . ." That statement opened the negotiation of three treaties transferring sovereignty to Panama, providing for a new administration of the Canal and establishing a defense of the Canal by the United States. These treaties were not submitted to either government for ratification.

The memorandum continues, "President Nixon has established negotiating objectives similar to those of President Johnson in 1964, modified by developments since 1967. Continued U.S. control and defense of the existing canal are non-negotiable U.S. requirements in a new treaty." This is the dishonesty—the implication that the U.S. can control or defend the canal after transferring sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama.

The control and defense of territory are powers of sovereignty. When the sovereign contracts the exercise of these powers to another entity, it may unilaterally abrogate the contract with or without cause. In 1956, Egypt unilaterally abrogated a contract for the building and operation of the Suez Canal which had been in operation since 1869.

If the United States transfers sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, it delivers control and defense of the canal to Panama. Any treaty arrangements for U.S. sharing in control or defense will be subject to unilateral cancellation by Panama. Panama could

denounce these treaties and negotiate with the Soviet Union or Red China to operate and defend the Canal. The United States would then be forced to choose war or withdrawal. If it resorted to force to preserve this vital waterway, it would be acting in violation of international law, because it had surrendered sovereignty.

The inane quality of our statecraft is expressed in the purpose of removing "causes of friction between the two countries". A diplomacy which seeks to remove causes of friction with other countries invites those countries to make new demands (causes of friction) upon the United States. The policy is self-defeating.

Diplomacy should promote fair and equitable relations with other nations. It must have clear objectives to which it will adhere whether the other countries concur or not.

U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone is in all respects a fair and reasonable arrangement. It is essential to the continued secure operation of the canal. It made possible an undertaking which has brought great benefits to Panama. It is the duty of diplomacy today, as under Presidents Hoover, Truman and Eisenhower, to inform Panama firmly that while administrative arrangements are subject to reasonable adjustment, U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone will be as enduring as the canal itself.

It is the duty of Panama to accept this arrangement in good grace and cooperate in our common interest. If Panama becomes hostile, the United States should discharge all Panamanian employees and administer the Zone with American citizens. That is the eventuality for which sovereignty must be preserved. We don't want it to happen; but it is a better prospect than making war against Panama to recover by conquest rights which we have surrendered through diplomatic stupidity.

PROVIDING FOR TIMELY SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST CHINA

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as we move into a new era of relationship with the government of mainland China, I feel it appropriate to consider the residue of our past contacts and associated problems in an effort to evolve the cleanest possible slate on which to build. It is in this endeavor that I introduce today a sense of the Congress resolution calling for the timely settlement of outstanding claims under the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949.

A large body of American citizens suffered significant financial loss when property they owned was confiscated by the current mainland China government without compensation or even any attempt at due process. To the present time the People's Republic of China has given no indication that these claims, properly processed under the laws of the United States, will be honored.

We have the means at hand, Mr. Speaker, to resolve this issue, in the form of frozen People's Republic of China assets in the United States which could be utilized to satisfy any rightful claims. Our Government has recognized its obligation under international law in not

releasing these moneys to either claimant. However, if in fact our President is anticipating laying a new groundwork for normalcy between these governments, one condition should be the satisfaction of established claims and, likewise, if appropriate, the release of any excess funds to the People's Republic of China to which it has a claim.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I present the text of my resolution for insertion in the RECORD:

H. CON. RES. 411

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States shall not make any concession to, or enter into any agreement with, the Government of the Peoples Republic of China until such government has expressed agreement to arrange for equitable settlement of all claims of nationals of the United States against such government received and determined by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission under title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949.

PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE NEW TOKAIDO LINE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE NEW TOKAIDO LINE

(Graphs and illustrations not printed in the RECORD)

(Address September 8, 1971, Before Fifth International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh, Pa.—Hideo Shima, President, National Space Development Agency of Japan)

1. Operating results of the New Tokaido Line in the past six years.

(1) Route of the line, Distance and running time between stations.

As shown on Fig. 1 (not printed in the RECORD).

(2) Yearly increase in passenger traffic.

Passenger traffic on the line has shown a big increase from year to year. In the five year period from 1965, the year after the line was opened, to 1970 the number of passengers carried grew 2.8 times, from 31 million to 85 million. This means that only in the one year of 1970, as much as 85% of the population of Japan rode on the New Tokaido Line, and that the line carried an average of 230,000 passengers per day in that year. The greatest number carried on the line so far in one day was 520,000 on May 5th (Monday), 1969.

(3) Average distance of travel on the line.

The average distance of travel per passenger on the line is longer in the case of the Hikari train which stops at two intermediate stations and shorter with the Kodama train which stops at all the 11 intermediate stations. The rise in 1970 (1st half) is considered to have been caused by the EXPO.

(4) Contribution to EXPO '70 transportation.

The EXPO was held in Osaka from March to September, 1970. During this period the New Tokaido Line played an indispensable role in transporting the huge number of

visitors, without a single accident, and was acclaimed as the "moving pavilion of Japan".

Total Visitors to EXPO, 64 million.

Visitors using JNR trains, 22 million (34%).

Of above figure, visitors using New Tokaido Line, 9 million (14%).

(5) Passenger analysis.

As shown on Fig. 5 (not printed in RECORD).

(6) Impact of the New Tokaido Line on the region served.

The New Tokaido Line, the first commercial high-speed railway in the world, has cut the time-distance between Tokyo and Osaka into half, making it possible to go and return between any point along the line in a day. This facilitation of travel has had an economic and social impact on the region served by the line and on the nation as a whole.

a. Change in passenger flow pattern.

The inauguration of the line served to actualize the potential transport demand, bringing about a great increase in the volume of middle-distance passenger traffic such as between Tokyo and Osaka, and between Tokyo and Nagoya, changing the passenger flow pattern.

b. Qualitative change in passenger traffic.

There is not much difference in the time spent when travelling by the New Tokaido Line and by airplane, but rail fare is only half of that for air, and besides, it is safer and more punctual on the New Tokaido Line. This has popularized the line. For business men in Tokyo and Osaka it has become the practice to leave in the morning, do business at the other end and return the same day, using the line. Also, admission tickets to large theaters in Tokyo have come to be put on sale in Nagoya and Osaka. Thus, the traffic for business as well as private purposes has undergone a qualitative change.

c. Change in tourist resort geography.

Inauguration of the New Tokaido Line has changed the geography of the tourist resorts along the line. Before, Atami was considered as a resort for the people of Tokyo, but on account of the line, it is now readily accessible from the Osaka area. This is also the case with Kii Shirahama which used to be frequented by the people in the Osaka area, but is now readily accessible from Tokyo. In particular, there has been a big increase in the visitors to the sightseeing spots in the Tokai Region midway between Tokyo and Osaka. On the other hand, the New Tokaido Line has made travelling to convenient that more and more tourists are making day trips to these resorts without staying there overnight, affecting the hotels.

d. Impact on regional economy.

By using an econometric model (dynamic inter-regional input-output model), a measurement was made to find out the extent the New Tokaido Line contributed to the growth of the national economy. According to this measurement, it is estimated that in 1966 the gross regional product increased by 150,000 million yen in the Tokai Region around Nagoya, by 123,000 million yen in the Kinki Region around Osaka, by 117,000 million yen in the Kanto Region around Tokyo, and by 423,000 million yen in gross national product, compared with what the case would have been if the line had not been built. This means that the New Tokaido Line greatly accelerated the concentration of industries in the Tokai and Kinki Regions. Likewise, the line brought about a concentration of the working population in the areas served by the line. Of the national increase of 186,000 in working population, it is estimated that the Tokai Region accounted for 68,000, Kanto Region 57,000, and Kinki Region 50,000.

(7) Operating results.

a. Number of trains and traffic volume.

The line was opened with 30 round trips per day, but this was increased to 101 round trips on weekdays in October 1970. Altogether, 350 million passengers have been car-

ried on the line in the six year period after its opening.

b. Great reduction in train delay.

In the early stage some train delays were experienced, but as the performance of rolling stock and facilities as well as rail tracks became stable and with the implementation of measures for prevention of natural disasters, there has been a great reduction in train delays.

c. No passenger casualty.

There has not been a single passenger casualty since opening of the line.

(8) Maintenance.

a. Maintenance of rolling stock.

Inspection ranges from the simple daily trip inspection to the general inspection which is carried out after each 720,000 km of operation with all the parts disassembled. Thus, there are different kinds of inspections in accordance with the distance of run. Also, to assure safe operation at high speed, extra care is taken in inspecting the running gear with specially provided inspection equipment. The main kinds of inspection and their interval are as follows:

(1) Trip inspection: At Tokyo or Osaka Car Depot, each 48 hour.

(2) Intermediate inspection: At Tokyo or Osaka Car Depot, each 30,000 km.

(3) Bogie truck inspection: At Osaka Car Depot, each 240,000 km.

(4) General inspection: At Hamamatsu Workshop, each 720,000 km.

Besides, the performance and characteristic of the ATC (automatic train control) equipment are inspected at each trip inspection and at intermediate inspections when all parts are inspected without disassembling them. As to the axles, they are inspected by ultra-sonic flaw detectors during intermediate inspection. Further, computers are used extensively in conducting final checks after general inspection for greater reliability and to shorten the work process.

b. Maintenance of track.

To keep the tracks fit for high-speed operation, there have been set up 4 track maintenance depots, and under these depots there have been placed 12 track maintenance subdepots, 7 mechanized track maintenance subdepots and 54 track inspection gangs at 10 km intervals. The maintenance system consists of the inspection and the actual maintenance work, each being specialized. It is the function of inspection to ascertain track conditions for safe operation and to secure the necessary data for planning the actual maintenance work. This is carried out by the daily car vibration test and patrol by car, daily patrol on foot, periodic general inspections and the track irregularity inspection by high-speed track inspection car once every 10 days. The maintenance plan is set up based on the inspection results and the actual maintenance work is conducted either by JNR itself or by contract, using large machines.

c. Maintenance of electrical facilities.

To maintain the electrical facilities of the New Tokaido Line in a good condition, 4 electrical facilities maintenance depots and 10 subdepots have been set up along the line. These depots and subdepots carry out the inspection and repair work at night. In addition, a system of inspection employing statistical control methods has been set up for greater reliability, based on studies and experiences of the past six years. Further, to see how electrical facilities are actually functioning during train operation, a testing car for the purpose is operated about once every week at the same speed as commercial trains. The measurements made by the car are sent to the electrical facilities maintenance depots in the form of immediate reports, weekly reports and monthly reports and these reports are used in carrying out inspection and repair work and in strengthening the facilities.

(9) Financial results.

The New Tokaido Line started to make a profit from the third of operation and in fiscal 1969 the operating ratio (100 × expense/revenue) of 52% was attained.

(10) Effect on the old narrow gauge Tokaido Line.

With the opening of the New Tokaido Line, the number of daytime express trains was greatly reduced on the old narrow gauge Tokaido Line, and in place, more local passenger trains and freight trains were operated, thus increasing commuter and freight transport capacity which had been badly needed.

2. Plan for construction of nationwide high-speed railway network.

(1) Characteristics of high-speed railways.

The New Tokaido Line was opened on October 1, 1964, and six years have elapsed since then. In the meantime, the line brought about a great change in the travel pattern. It became common for business men to go from Tokyo to Osaka, or vice versa, and return the same day. Also, the line made Hakone and Atami easily accessible from

the Osaka area and the same with Kyoto and Nara from the Tokyo area.

It is considered that the remarkable growth of traffic on the New Tokaido Line is due to the recognition by the people of the following merits of the line.

a. Safety.

Being guided by rail, the railway is very much suited to the application of safety measures by electronic and other techniques. Especially in the case of a railway like the New Tokaido Line, the entire right of way is segregated from road traffic, and further, a very high degree of safety can be attained by transforming the railway into a plant industry through adoption of the automatic train control system and automatic disorder detecting devices and other means. Accordingly, there has not been a single casualty on the New Tokaido Line.

b. Capability for mass transport.

The capability for mass transport is a great merit of the railway, this being especially so in the case of a high-speed railway like the New Tokaido Line. This capability has been amply demonstrated during EXPO

'70 and by the fact that as many as 520,000 passengers were carried on the line in a single day. By coupling a number of cars together, the railway can carry large volumes of traffic in one movement, a feat which would be difficult to accomplish by road or air transport. In this connection, according to a comparative study of the transport capacity by rail (high-speed) and road (expressway) in Japan, it was found that the capacity by rail was twice as much as that by road per hour and four times greater per meter of width of the right of way, and that the average speed was two to three times higher.

c. Speed.

The New Tokaido Line has changed the old image of the railway and its high speed can meet the needs of modern society. Besides, with respect to accessibility to the city center, the railway is more advantageous than air transport and this helps to reduce the travel time between city centers. A comparison of the time taken to travel between Tokyo and Osaka by different means of transport is shown in the Fig. 12.

FIGURE 12.—TRAVELING TIME BETWEEN TOKYO AND OSAKA BY DIFFERENT MEANS OF TRANSPORT

Means of transport	Between	Time required	Access time	Total
High-speed railway (Hikari train).....	Tokyo and Shin-Osaka.....	3 hours 10 minutes.....		3 hours 10 minutes
High-speed bus.....	Tokyo and Shin-Osaka.....	8 hours.....		8 hours
Airway.....	Tokyo and Osaka.....	50 minutes.....	Tokyo 60 minutes; Osaka 25 minutes; waiting time at airport 20 minutes	2 hours 35 minutes

d. Punctual service.

In road transport, the flow of traffic is being impeded on account of road congestion, and at the airport, prolonged waiting time for landing is becoming chronic due to shortage of airport space. On account of these causes, it is becoming more and more difficult to secure punctual road and air services.

On the other hand, in a modernized high-speed railway system, it is possible to assure punctual operation of trains by means of a well-equipped automatic train control system. The New Tokaido Line is a case in point. Moreover, depending on future technical development, there is the possibility of complete automation of train operation. At least, by adopting cab signals as in the case of the New Tokaido Line, train operation will hardly be affected by fog. Further, in the case of the new high-speed railway network to be built in Japan, if adequate measures are taken with respect to the snow problem, punctuality of train operation can be assured in all weather.

In other words, it can be said that what appealed to the people were the safe, comfortable and fast service of the New Tokaido Line, the location of the terminals in the city centers and the freedom from worry about the availability of seats made possible by frequent operation of trains.

Thus, by cutting the time-distance between Tokyo and Osaka into half and bringing the whole area served by the New Tokaido Line into a day trip zone, the impact of the line has been large, indeed.

(2) Formation of an integrated transport system.

The rapid growth of economy and the advancement of transport technique have greatly expanded the interflow of people, goods and information, and it is most likely that this trend will continue in the future. In order to be capable of meeting the demands of a more prosperous future society, there will be the need of forming a new transport system which will make the most of the strong points of each mode of transport. This new transport system should be integrated on a nationwide scale, and by coordinating the function of rail, road and air carriers for linear, area-wise and inter-point transport respectively, a transport

structure most effective from the national economic standpoint should be formed.

(3) The need of modern high-speed railways in the integrated transport system.

In forming an integrated transport system, it will be necessary to see that each means of transport will be able to display its strong points and to coordinate their services so that the most effective system may be established.

High-speed railways are superior to road and air transport in the field of mass transport over middle and long distances. According to studies made so far, the characteristics of each means of transport can be summarized, qualitatively.

Fig. 15. (not reproduced) shows the trend in a conceptual distribution of passengers among airway, expressway and high-speed railway; according to which a peak in long distance, short distance and middle distance is noticeable in the respective means of transport. Thus, by having the expressway and airway undertake mainly short distance and long distance transport respectively, and the high-speed railway taking over that part between the two, an effective transport system can be formed.

In this sense, there is the need to construct high-speed railways as an essential part of the new transport system as advocated in the New Comprehensive National Development Plan of the Government.

(4) Effect of high-speed railways.

The following effect can be expected upon construction of high-speed railways in the framework of an integrated transport system:

a. Effect on the welfare of the people.

The construction of a nationwide high-speed railway network will greatly reduce the traveling time between principal cities and thereby enlarge the people's range of action in a day. As a result, the cultural and social status of regional cities will rise, lessening the difference between metropolitan and regional cities. As people will be able to enjoy the living standards of a metropolis while residing in a regional city where the living environment is good the trend of over-population in metropolitan areas and under-population in regional areas will be mitigated, promoting effective land usage.

Figure 16 shows the traveling time from Tokyo and Osaka to the other principal cities upon completion of the high-speed railway network.

FIG. 16.—TRAVELING TIME TO MAIN CITIES FROM TOKYO AND OSAKA UPON COMPLETION OF HIGH-SPEED RAILWAY NETWORK

	Time required			
	Present		Future	
	Hours	Minutes	Hours	Minutes
Between Tokyo and—				
Sapporo.....	17	20	5	50
Morioka.....	6	00	2	30
Sendai.....	3	50	1	40
Niigata.....	4	00	1	30
Kanazawa.....	5	20	1	50
Between Osaka and—				
Kagoshima.....	13	40	4	20
Kumamoto.....	10	00	3	30
Hakata.....	8	20	2	50
Hiroshima.....	4	10	1	40
Kanazawa.....	3	00	1	30

A huge amount of time can be saved upon realization of a high-speed railway network, and it is estimated that this would amount to 130 million man-hours in 1968 and 1,290 million man-hours in 1985 if passengers hitherto transported on the old narrow gauge lines were to be transported on high-speed lines. In terms of working population this is equivalent to 60,000 and 600,000 respectively. This time-saving effect of the high-speed railway will help to reduce the labor shortage and increase spare time, thereby having a great effect on the living conditions of the people.

In connection with public welfare, what is becoming all the more urgent is the solution of environmental problems. The level of the economy of Japan has risen considerably in recent years and so has her international economic standing. Personal income has risen and the supply of consumer goods has become plentiful. On the other hand, the sudden growth in economy has brought about a high concentration in population and industry, and where social capital could not adequately meet the situation, the problem of environmental disruption arose.

In the field of transport, this is seen in traffic jams, air pollution from exhaust gas, traffic accidents and noise.

With a railway like the New Tokaido Line, however, there is no problem with respect to air pollution and traffic accidents, and besides, as such a railway would ordinarily be built right into the city center, the problem of congestion of secondary transport means to the city center, as in the case of air travel, would not arise.

In short, modern high-speed railways can provide safe transport, free from public hazard, over middle and long distances. This will in turn serve to facilitate the dispersion of industries, correct regional disparities, and promote the realization of a more affluent society by satisfying the leisure purpose demand which is bound to grow in the future.

b. Effect on regional development.

The construction and improvement of transport facilities, including high-speed railways, will not only have the direct effect of increasing the volume of passenger and freight traffic making use of such facilities, but by affecting regional industry, they will also exert an indirect effect from the national economic standpoint. According to an estimate made on the effect of the opening of the New Tokaido Line on regional development, it was found that economic indices such as those on capital stock, value of production and income rose considerably in the regions directly affected by the opening of

the line. As an example, in Fig. 17 there is shown the production value of the different industries in the Tokai Region (around Nagoya).

In this way, the opening of high-speed railways accelerates the economic activity of the regions served by them. Therefore, with the extension of such lines throughout the country, the economic activity in the various regions served will become more brisk and this will help to solve the problem of over-and-under-population, promote regional development and contribute to the economic development of the nation as a whole.

FIG. 17.—EFFECT OF NEW TOKAIDO LINE ON PRODUCTION VALUE OF DIFFERENT INDUSTRIES IN TOKAI REGION

	[In 100,000,000 yens]		
	Production value in 1970(a)	That part of (a) estimated to have been attributable to New Tokaido Line (b)	Ratio (b)/(a)×100 (percent)
Primary industry.....	3,089	112	3.6
Secondary industry....	81,206	3,343	4.1
Tertiary industry.....	27,546	866	3.2

c. Effective usage of the old narrow gauge railway.

With the construction of high-speed railways, the express passenger train service on the old narrow gauge lines will be taken over by the new lines, making way for separate usage of the lines, that is, passenger service on the new line and freight service on the old line. This will mean that there will be less variation in train speed on the old line, thereby simplifying train operation for greater efficiency and larger transport capacity.

As a result, it will become possible to make big improvements in the services of the old line such as by expansion of modern container and freightliner services and by mitigation of commuter train congestion. In addition, the old line can provide supplementary services to the new line. Particularly, in regard to the freight service on the old line, it will be possible to transform it into a new system capable of flexibly meeting customer demands, quick delivery and punctual service.

(5) Nationwide high-speed railway network project.

a. Line under construction (New San-yo Line).

The new Tokaido Line thus giving a very successful result is now being extended 560 km westward over Osaka towards Hakata, the center of Kyushu industrial area, along the Seto Inland Sea.

The construction is well on schedule and the section Osaka-Okayama will be duly opened to the traffic on April 1972.

FIG. 19.—NEW TOKAIDO LINE AND NEW SAN-YO LINE, CONSTRUCTION COST AND EXTENSION BY STRUCTURE

Lines	Construction cost (approximate) (million yen)	Length (km)				
		Total	Tunnel	Bridge	Viaduct	Bed road
New Tokaido Line.....	3,800	515.8	68.6	57.1	115.8	274.3
Percent.....		(100)	(13)	(11)	(23)	(53)
New San-yo Line:						
Shin-Osaka/Okayama.....	1,700	161.8	57.0	17.9	70.2	16.7
Percent.....		(100)	(35)	(11)	(44)	(10)
Okayama/Hakata.....	4,800	398	210	14	84	90
Percent.....		(100)	(53)	(3)	(21)	(23)

b. Lines to be constructed and those proposed.

It was under the foregoing circumstances that the "Law for Construction of Nationwide High-speed Railways" was enacted in May, 1970. The law has its objective the construction of high-speed railways on a nationwide scale.

Based on this law, in January, 1971 a basic plan was formulated for construction of the following high-speed lines:

New Tohoku Line (between Tokyo and Morioka).

New Joetsu Line (between Tokyo and Nagata).

New Narita Line (between Tokyo and Narita).

At the same time, it was proposed to have the following routes included in the high-speed rail network:

Tokyo—Toyama—Osaka.

Morioka—Sapporo.

Hakata—Kagoshima.

In April, 1971 the construction plan was decided upon for the New Tohoku, Joetsu and Narita Lines aforementioned and instruction was given to commence their construction. Figure 18 shows the three lines to be constructed and those proposed.

c. Outline of the three lines to be constructed.

FIGURE 20.—DEMAND FORECAST AND NUMBER OF TRAINS

	New Tohoku line		New Joetsu line		New Narita line	
	Traffic volume per year ¹	Number of trains per day	Traffic volume per year	Number of trains per day	Traffic volume per year ¹	Number of trains per day
1976.....	75	270	35	250	6	290
1985.....	163	410	78	480	12	290

¹ In 100,000,000 passenger-kilometer.

² 12 car trains.

³ 6 car trains.

⁴ 16 car trains.

Note: Traffic volume and number of trains for both ways.

FIGURE 21.—SHORTENING OF TRAVELING TIME

	Distance (km)	Time required—			
		By present line (a)	By high-speed railway (b)	Time shortened (b/a)	Percentage shortened (b/a)
New Tohoku line (between Tokyo and Morioka).....	1500	6:00	2:30	3:30	160
New Joetsu line (between Tokyo and Nagata).....	1300	4:00	1:30	2:30	160
New Narita line (between Tokyo and Narita).....	170	1:00	0:30	0:30	150

¹ Approximate.

Increase in added value (gross regional and national product).

The estimated increase in added value due to the construction of these high-speed railways is shown in the following table:

FIG. 22.—INCREASE IN ADDED VALUE (GROSS REGIONAL AND NATIONAL PRODUCT) ON ACCOUNT OF HIGH-SPEED RAILWAYS

High-speed railway and region	[In 100,000,000 yen]		
	Actual figure for 1965	Estimate for 1985	In case high-speed railways are not built
New Tohoku Line:			
Tohoku.....	15,000	60,000	+1,900
National.....	266,000	1,213,000	+900
New Joetsu Line:			
Kanto.....	107,000	528,000	+1,100
National.....	266,000	1,213,000	+300

Notes: 1. In terms of 1960 prices. 2. Direct effect from investment has been excluded.

(iv) Estimated construction cost: New Tohoku Line (Tokyo-Morioka), 800,000 million yens. New Joetsu Line (Tokyo-Nagata), 560,000 million yens. New Narita Line (Tokyo-Narita), 200,000 million yens.

d. Main technical developments to be conducted.

In consideration of the time factor relating to the construction and completion of the nationwide high-speed railway network, the

following standards used for the New Tokaido Line, that is,

- Gauge, 1,435 mm.
- 25,000 volt A.C. system with overhead current collection.
- Multiple unit system.

will be used for the new lines to be constructed for the nationwide network, but to attain higher speed and greater efficiency, technical development with regard to increasing speed, prevention against snow hazard, systemization of operational control, reduction of maintenance need and other aspects will be promoted.

(i) Maximum speed.

By improving track facilities, making car bodies lighter, improving the running performance of bogies and by other means, technical development is under way for attainment of the maximum speed of around 250 km/h.

(ii) Prevention against snow hazard.

To overcome snow hazard, research and technical development will be promoted on the following:

Improving the insulation of machinery and appliances and cold-and-snow-proof rolling stock.

Measures relating to icing of overhead line. Detection of weather information and transmission thereof.

Reducing the need of track maintenance and making the track snow-free.

As the projected New Joetsu Line will run through a district where there is over a meter of snowfall in a day and over four meters of snow accumulation on the ground, the above-mentioned measures will be adopted on a large scale. At cuts where there is likely to have snowdrifts and in station compounds where snow removing is not easy, snowsheds and other protective facilities will be provided. For the tracks between stations the usage of the open floor type elevated track structure and other means as well as the removal of snow by frequent running of passenger train with snow plough are being studied.

As there will be comparatively less snow along the route of the New Tohoku Line, it is considered that measures for the New Joetsu Line will suffice for this line.

(iii) Track structure.

To enable higher train speed and reduction in maintenance need it is planned to adopt solid bad tracks, and for the purpose, research and development work will be conducted on their structure, supporting system and rail fastening.

(iv) Electrical facilities.

Work will be carried out to develop a device for automatic compensation of voltage change and the double compound catenary.

(v) Train operation system.

In line with the policy for speedy and safe operation, computers will be used in combination with ATC and CTC to develop the Computer Aided Traffic Control System (COMTRAC System) for quick preparation and transmission of the most suitable train operating schedule to meet fluctuations in transport demand as well as to adjust the movement of trains when their normal operation is disrupted, and further, to enable automatic control of the routes in all such cases.

(vi) Structure of rolling stock.

Besides the measures to be taken for higher speed, train control and prevention of snow damage, semiconductors and higher polymer will be used to reduce the need of maintenance and light alloys employed to make the cars lighter.

e. The islands of Japan as measured by a time scale.

Upon the completion of the nationwide high-speed railway network in the future, travelling time will be shortened and the islands of Japan, as measured by a time scale,

will shrink as shown in the following figure (not reproduced).

3. Concluding remarks.

With the development of motor vehicles and aircraft the share of the railway has gone down, making many people think that the railway is an outmoded means of transport on the way to decline. However, it has been amply demonstrated by the New Tokaido Line that a new railway system capable of providing high-speed, comfortable, safe and punctual mass transport at low cost in all weather can meet the needs of the new age.

System engineering technique was put to maximum use with respect to the rolling stock, ground facilities, safety and train operation facilities and other aspects of the New Tokaido Line to create a new railway worthy of a plant industry. As such, the line has had a great economic and social effect, and on account of the new demand induced, the financial showing of the line has been extremely good. Thus, the line has been well received by the people of Japan as well as by the visitors from abroad.

Along with the growth of the economy in recent years, excessive concentration of the population and industries is taking place in metropolitan areas and the opposite phenomenon is seen in the regional localities. To put an end to this trend and make the land of Japan a more pleasant place to live in, the Government is now drawing up a plan for the formation of an integrated transport system, and the high-speed railway network will become an essential part of the system.

It is certain that the popularization of high-speed ground transportation systems, including modern high-speed railways, not only in Japan but in other countries as well, will, with necessary modification to meet each country's needs, bring immense benefits to all the people of the world.

VIET ELECTION A FARCE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the one-man presidential "election" planned for this Sunday in South Vietnam is an insult to every American, Vietnamese, and allied soldier who has been killed or wounded trying to help the people of that nation win the right of self-determination.

In a charge stage-managed by the American Ambassador, President Thieu is conclusively demonstrating for all the world to see how corrupt his regime really is and how immoral it is for the United States to continue supporting his government.

President Thieu, to placate his more friendly critics, has said that those people who oppose him can indicate it by, in some way, deforming their ballots. He even has offered to resign if a majority of the votes are cast against him.

What he does not say is that it is his handpicked village chiefs and election officials who turn out the voters and count the ballots. And many of these persons, the ones responsible for showing people how to vote against Thieu, have said they will do no such thing.

It is this kind of democracy for which we have given the lives of 50,000 of our

best young men—plus several hundred thousand more wounded and maimed—have bled our economy nearly to the breaking point and have seen the fabric of our Nation rent by domestic upheaval.

This farcical election is further evidence why we must immediately withdraw all American forces from Southeast Asia and cease our support of the corrupt Saigon government.

THE QUADRIPARTITE AGREEMENT ON BERLIN OF SEPTEMBER 3, 1971, AND THE FOREIGN SERVICE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the last 5 years I have on several occasions called attention to serious personnel problems in the Foreign Service. My reason for doing this was primarily because the evidence available indicated that there was an intimate connection or correlation between these personnel problems and the general issues of our foreign policy, our national security and even the relations between the State Department and Congress.

Whatever the original causal connection between these personnel issues and these general national security issues, I was struck with the fact that whenever there was a deep crisis in our foreign policy, there appeared to be a crisis also in the Foreign Service personnel system. The two appeared so regularly together, that they constituted what in scientific language is called a syndrome. Whenever one appears, the other also appears.

The most recent such syndrome concerns the so-called Quadripartite agreement on Berlin of September 3, 1971.

As you will recall, this agreement was negotiated and signed with great secrecy. When its terms were finally announced, the State Department claimed that it represented a major diplomatic victory for the United States, that it eliminated the occasions for future Berlin crises, and that it would help achieve stability and peace.

The ink was scarcely dry on that quadripartite agreement, when a major dispute immediately broke out between the West German Federal Republic and the East German regime as to what the "agreement meant." Certainly, the State Department had given the American people such clear assurances about the purposes and content of that agreement, and the solemnity with which all parties viewed it, that such a disagreement immediately after signing hardly was conceivable.

In order to document the origins of the current dispute over the treaty, I request permission to place into the RECORD two items which has appeared in the press in the last week. The first is a news item which appeared in the Washington Post on September 23, filed by that paper's foreign correspondent in Bonn, John M. Goshko. It indicates the nature of the

dispute about the Berlin agreement of September 3, 1971.

The second is an article which appeared 3 days earlier, on September 20, 1971, in the monthly magazine *Tactics*. This article not only analyzes comprehensively the terms of the Quadripartite agreement of September 3, 1971, but also reveals the concessions which the United States made to the Soviet Union and the East German regime. It is in this light in which the current dispute over Berlin should be seen.

Tactics states that the legal experts it has consulted have concluded that this quadripartite agreement is a "disaster" for the West. In fact, the magazine claims the disaster is—

More severe than those of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, or the building of the Berlin Wall.

I believe every American should read these two reports together. Together they explain fully the terms of that accord and place them in the perspective of other national foreign policies which are still emergent.

There is another reason why every American should read these two articles together. This is because *Tactics* reports the names of the authors of the Berlin agreement and the influences they have had on its formulation.

In this connection, I should like to remind the Members that during the last several years I have repeatedly called their attention to the "selection out" or firing of John Heminway by the State Department. His last assignment in the Foreign Service and State Department was as the Berlin desk officer in Washington, responsible for communicating our Berlin policies to the field. While in that post, he concluded that two of his superiors were no longer implementing the established foreign policy of the United States in Berlin. When he called this fact to the attention of senior State Department officials, he was "fired" through "selection out." His case is still under review in the executive branch to ascertain whether "malicious and untrue statements" were used in producing his "selection out."

It is quite clear to me that if Mr. Heminway had continued to be the Berlin desk officer, the problems and misunderstandings with which we are confronted today in Berlin would not have arisen.

Aside from the personalities involved in the *Tactics* article, the treaty-making aspects of Quadripartite agreement are of immense importance. Is the agreement, as *Tactics* claims, in actuality a treaty under the classification of an agreement? If so, I am sure the U.S. Senate will find this issue of great interest. Just recently the Senate Foreign Relations Committee released a study by the Foreign Affairs Division of the Library of Congress entitled, "The Senate Role in Foreign Affairs Appointments" which deals with "the role of the Senate in making appointments relating to the conduct of foreign policy." In the preface to the study the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, stated that "a study of the constitutional powers to make treaties and exec-

utive agreements is ready to be undertaken." If the charges made in the *Tactics* article concerning the Quadripartite agreement are correct, perhaps a review of this agreement will provide interesting material for the upcoming study.

The two above-mentioned items follow:
[From the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1971]
GERMANY'S BREAK OFF TALKS ABOUT BERLIN
(By John M. Goshko)

BONN.—The latest effort to resolve the deadlock between the two Germanys over implementation of the four-power Berlin agreement was broken off today after only 30 minutes of discussion.

This abrupt ending to the meeting in East Berlin repeated the pattern that has been evident ever since the "inner-German phase" of the Berlin negotiations began earlier this month. No date was set for the next meeting.

The four-power agreement, signed on Sept. 3, will not become final until East and West Germany agree on the practical steps necessary to implement its provisions.

However, these talks, being conducted principally by West German State Secretary Egon Bahr and his East German counterpart Michael Kohl, have been stalled from the outset over differences in interpreting the agreements text.

In particular, they have been arguing over a German-language version of the agreement. A German translation had been agreed to by all parties before the Sept. 3 signing, but the East Germans have since contended that they are not bound by that and have tried to substitute their own translation.

Armed with its text, East Germany has insisted on interpreting the agreement to mean that it can negotiate separate accords with the authorities in Bonn and in West Berlin on access to the city and East Germany. Bonn has insisted on a single German-level access agreement to be negotiated by West Germany.

Last week Chancellor Willy Brandt visited Soviet Communist Party leader Leonid Brezhnev, and is believed to have asked for his assistance in making the East Germans more cooperative. Brandt is understood to have reminded Brezhnev that Bonn's treaties with the Soviet Union and Poland cannot be ratified until the Berlin accord is complete.

Although the Bonn government will not even admit that the matter was discussed, the impression is that Brandt received satisfactory assurances from the Soviets. Informed sources here say, however, that no change can be expected in the Bahr-Kohl talks until they have gone through several more sessions.

This was underscored by Bahr today on his return to West Berlin. He told reporters that he and Kohl were still at an impasse over the German text, and said: "In the circumstances, it was not possible to continue the factual negotiations on traffic questions."

On the other side, the East German news agency ADN issued a report accusing Bahr of delaying tactics. It said Kohl "regretted the West German attitude and reiterated East Germany's willingness to conclude the negotiations quickly."

U.S. POLICY REVERSAL INCLUDES W. GERMANY AS WELL AS CHINA
(By the Insider)

While world capitals have been preoccupied with the potential disaster to the free world from President Nixon's upcoming trip to Peking, an actual disaster already has taken place in Europe. Legal experts say this disaster is "more severe than those of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, or the building of the Berlin Wall."

Its official name is the "Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin of Sept. 3, 1971," actu-

ally signed on Sept. 4, and is also referred to as the Berlin Accords, the Berlin Agreement, and more realistically, the Berlin Treaty. As a matter of fact, it is a six-power treaty binding on the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Soviet Union, Western Federal Republic of Germany, and the Eastern, so-called German Democratic Republic.

In effect, it is the peace treaty ending World War II, on terms reflecting practically a total victory for the Soviet Union. So far as American foreign policy is concerned, it extends to Europe the same concepts and principles as did the American policy shift in Asia from the free Republic of China to Communist China.

CAPITULATIONS REJECTED BY PRECEDING PRESIDENTS

In the same manner as we have abandoned Free China as the sole, legitimate spokesman and heir to Chinese national statehood, the United States under this treaty abandons its support of the Federal Republic of Germany as the sole legitimate successor to German statehood.

Through this treaty, the U.S. State Department, with the endorsement of the White House, has reversed 25 years of American foreign policy initiated by President Truman, sustained by President Eisenhower; and preserved even by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson despite all the efforts of their pro-Soviet advisors to appease the communist bloc.

A decisive concession that even President Kennedy was not prepared to make now has been granted to the Soviet Union and the East German regime. There are today three Germanys.

They are the Federal Republic, our ally; the East German so-called German Democratic Republic, the Soviet puppet, and an extraordinary equity called "the sectors of West Berlin," which has no international standing, and at best will be no more than a new Danzig.

As Danzig was the immediate cause and pretext for World War II, this new, unstable "sectors of West Berlin" may well have within it the seeds of World War III.

Supposedly, all this was done in the name of international peace and a reduction of tensions in Europe. Just as supposedly, the seating of Red China in the Security Council was to be done in the name of international peace and a reduction of tensions in Asia.

"What, in fact, does the Berlin accord of Sept. 3 provide? The agreement affects Allied rights both in Berlin and in Germany as a whole."

First, and for the first time, the accord legally recognizes the legitimacy of the Berlin Wall by omitting all reference to the Soviet "sector" of Berlin, or even to the eastern sector of Berlin. Instead of these clear political and legal terms, the treaty describes the Berlin sector as "areas bordering" on the Western sectors of the city. Thus even that earlier distinction which the United States made between Berlin's Soviet sector and the Soviet zone of Germany has been eroded.

SERIES OF CAPITULATIONS

Secondly, while totally bowing to the Soviet Union on the issue of the Soviet sector, the United States and its Western allies also have capitulated to the Soviet positions by admitting there is no such thing even as West Berlin.

Up to Sept. 3, the Allies had steadfastly insisted that there was a single Berlin governed by a single allied body, the Kommandatura, which the Soviet Union was boycotting because the Western Allies had refused to allow the Russians to paralyze that body by vetoes within it.

In the Sept. 3 accord, the United States conceded the Soviet position, and admitted there was no such thing as a single body, but solely three sectors in West Berlin. Consequently, the term, "West Berlin," which

President Kennedy substituted for the term, "Berlin," after the building of the Berlin Wall, no longer has any legal or political meaning, and is reduced solely to a geographic expression, with no significance.

On top of these major concessions, the Western Allies collectively and individually acknowledge that while they have no rights in the Soviet sector, the Soviet Union does have rights in each of the Western sectors of Berlin equal to the rights each of them enjoy in the other Western sectors.

That is, the Soviet Union has the same rights in the French sector as the United Kingdom and the United States have. Or reciprocally, the Soviet Union has the same rights in the U.S. sector as the French and United Kingdom governments have.

These Soviet rights are to be exercised through the Soviet consulate general which, under the terms of the agreements, must be accorded the same rights in each Western sector that each Western power accords to the consulates of the other two Western powers in its own sector.

Even this is not the end of the concessions to the Soviet Union. Up to now, the three Western powers, to emphasize the fact that they were acting legally as a single entity, have issued passports—travel documents—to Berlin residents from a single allied office, irrespective of the sector in which the residents lived. This allied travel office was located in the office of the quadripartite Allied Control Council in the American sector of Berlin.

Under this treaty, no Berlin resident traveling to the Soviet Union or any Soviet bloc country will receive such a document. Instead, he will receive a so-called "passport," issued by the Federal Republic, into which is stamped the legend, "issued in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement on Sept. 3, 1971."

This is the most humiliating document ever imposed on Western Germany by the Soviet Union and by West Germany's allies, because by issuing such a document to West German residents, the Federal Government of West Germany will be acting "in a consular capacity." This means it formally and solemnly recognizes that Berlin is not now and will not in the future be part of West Germany.

West Berlin thus becomes foreign soil to West Germany. This is precisely what the Soviet Union has been seeking by all possible means for 25 years.

FRUIT OF ROGERS-KISSINGER WORK

This development, in light of the Rogers-Kissinger doctrine of appeasement of communist states, will disconcert but not surprise informed observers. The question arises, however, as to why and how the Western, republican government of Willy Brandt could legally and politically agree to it.

The fact is that the Brandt government, in agreeing to this Berlin accord, did so in a manner that violated the West German Constitution. The Federal Republic's Constitution clearly distinguishes between the office of the federal President, in whom the function of national sovereignty is incorporated, and the office of the prime minister, the chancellor, which only reflects the role of governments, as they come and go under the electoral process.

Consequently, the claim of the Federal Republic to be the sole, legitimate bearer of statehood—nationhood—is not incorporated in the offices of the government, in Willy Brandt's as chancellor, but in the office of the President, Gustav Heinemann, as head of state.

He is elected by the Bundesversammlung, the national congress that consists of all the members of the Bundestag, equivalent to the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Bundesrat, similar to the U.S. Senate. Acting jointly, as an electoral college, they elect the President.

In contrast, the chancellor is elected solely by the Bundestag. The composition of the Bundestag is determined by popular vote according to proportional representation. The members of the Bundesrat are appointees of the "laender," or states.

Hitherto, the national congress met in West Berlin, usually flown in by American planes, and there elected the national President. But under the new agreement, the American government, Western allies, and West German government that sits at Bonn, all formally and solemnly agree that the President can no longer be legally elected in Berlin.

This, too, is one of the major objectives which Moscow has been fighting for during the past quarter of a century.

This phenomenal reversal of all past American foreign policy, remarkably enough, did not come about because of any current Berlin crisis. In fact, there was no crisis in Berlin at all. The reasons, therefore, are not to be found in pressures coming from Moscow but in the secret, "privileged" internal documents of the State Department and the White House.

The Berlin accord of Sept. 3, 1971 is the result of the Rogers-Kissinger appeasement of the Soviet Union and Red China. This is the primary source.

Besides William Pierce Rogers and Henry Alfred Kissinger, its main authors are Helmut Sonnenfeldt, special adviser to Kissinger, Martin J. Hillenbrand, assistant secretary of European affairs in the State Department, James S. Sutterlin, director of German affairs in the State Department, and Jonathan Dean, counsellor for political affairs in the American Embassy in Bonn.

Sonnenfeldt leaked information to Nelson Rockefeller and Kissinger when engaged in intelligence research in the State Department. This is related to the secret group that has consistently worked towards an appeasing arrangement with the communist nations. Sonnenfeldt, like Kissinger, is German-born and a refugee. As a Soviet expert in the State Department, Sonnenfeldt assured President Kennedy that Moscow would never place missiles in Cuba. Although lacking foreign service, Sonnenfeldt was appointed by President Nixon in August, 1970 to be foreign service officer, class 1, a top position. He still lacks foreign service. His relationship to Kissinger is sufficient!

PROTEGE OF AMBASSADOR BEAM

Hillenbrand is a protege of Jacob Beam, ambassador to Moscow, whose Warsaw embassy became notorious for its sex and spy scandals.

Serious security charges were raised when Sutterlin was promoted to foreign service officer, class 1, in 1968. Dean has long been an advocate of strong Soviet-American ties and a dismantling of the North American Treaty Organization (NATO).

These officers, and others with their outlook, succeeded to positions of power following the elimination of several American foreign service officers from key posts on the German desk in the White House, the State Department and at Bonn, who had been accurate on Soviet encroachment, and recommended that we resist red expansion in Europe through traditional American policies.

Significantly, the Berlin agreement of Sept. 3, 1971 was brought about without any role in it being filled by the American Mission in Berlin, which is known to regard it as "disastrous."

Equally significant, a purge similar to that carried out on the German desks also took place among the China experts in the State Department. Indeed, the rationale for the retention and even elevation of the most pro-Marxist and appeasing element in the State Department—the holdovers—is to be found in the fact that only they would tolerate such deals.

The short and even crude shrift given to those who did not fit into this category is understandable only from this standpoint.

SHOWN BY U.S. TOWARD REDS

U.S. policy seems designed, in effect, to give our friends no alternative but to reject us and join our enemies, as has been the world pattern. One needs only to look at the map, and try to make any sense out of the no-win, self-destructive manner in which our military have been hamstrung by no-win policy in Viet Nam, as it was in Korea.

So far as the so-called principal beneficiaries of this agreement—the West Berliners—are concerned, they no longer even know whether they are German nationals any more.

"When they travel to the Soviet Zone or to any other country, they must have two documents—one the worthless passport and the other an identity card issued by the local authorities in the district of the sector where they live.

Should they accidentally have any problem with the police in a communist country, the East German, communist government has as much claim to handle their case, in the specious role of their "protector," as the West German government.

This cynical arrangement also is the fruit of the Sept. 3, 1971 agreement. If the Nixon administration were determined to push West Germans into the red embrace, such steps would be the obvious procedure. The success of this sort of maneuver can be attributed to highly skilled exploitation of the so-called "pragmatic approach" of the U.S. government, and its obsession with present opinion polls and the upcoming national elections.

If these West Germans are prudent, under the circumstances described, and want effective consular services, they will find it advisable not to even show the new, so-called quadripartite, West German "passport." Can anyone believe seriously that once a West Berliner is "protected" by the East German, communist government, that this person thereafter will be left alone? He certainly will be expected to reciprocate the services that he has been rendered, and give evidence of loyalty to his new "protectors."

He will know, too, that basically, he has to thank the U.S. government for his predicament, for without it, the nefarious deal could never have been put over.

This American role even has come out on the floor of the Congress. If a Democratic administration were in office, there would have been a tempest over it.

But the fact of it being a Republican administration has stymied most critics in the Republican Party, and allowed only decorous whispers of it to come up, as in the colloquy on the Senate floor on Sept. 17 between Hugh Scott (R-Pa.), as minority leader, and Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), as majority leader.

Mansfield, referring to "the Berlin accord," said: "The President played a very significant personal part at a critical point in bringing that to fruition."

This was an extraordinary revelation that was not referred to by any of the news channels. By it, though, the astute Mansfield was pinpointing the responsibility for history, and future American elections, as the opportunity arises.

Thus we have outlined the supposed great benefit gained for stalwart West Berliners under the Rogers-Kissinger doctrine. We have a warning in this, too, of the kind of benefit that awaits the Chinese people, on the Chinese mainland as well as on Taiwan, under the same Rogers-Kissinger approach.

OUTDOES EVEN MACHIAVELLI

This secret diplomacy extends even farther, as a capitulation, than in the dark days of Machiavelli.

Actually, it is unconditional surrender by the U.S. government, as demonstrated by the unprecedented consent it has given, sight unseen, to a still unwritten paragraph in the Sept. 3 agreement, entitled:

"Final Quadripartite Protocol."

The section, numbered 2, declares:

"The four Governments proceed on the basis that the following agreements and arrangements concluded between the competent German authorities shall enter into force simultaneously with the Quadripartite Agreement: (to be filled in after agreements concluded.)"

In practice, under such circumstances, "competent German authorities" means the German Soviet regime, for the West Germans, left adrift this way, are in no position to assert themselves. The East Germans already simply have refused to admit the West German representatives to discussions on this matter.

In addition to the American officials mentioned, the principal authorship of the Berlin treaty rests with Egon Bahr, special political adviser to Willy Brandt. He met secretly several times with Henry Kissinger and Helmut Sonnenfeldt in Washington.

Following these meetings, he communicated secretly with Soviet officials with whom he has had contacts for more than 20 years. Bahr's main political goal is reputedly to reunify Germany as the principal ally of the Soviet Union, to drive the United States out of Europe, and to establish a Berlin-Moscow Axis.

So far as the U.S. Congress is concerned, it simply has not been provided with information by the Nixon administration, and has had to depend on the American press for what it knows. The press, though, has at best acted as a mouthpiece for the official line, much as does Tass news agency.

Tass portrays the deal as a victory. But the American newspapers and radio-television conceal this claim, describing the deal as a great, American diplomatic achievement.

Actually, the Berlin action by U.S. authorities has produced a treaty of prime importance to the United States. Congress has the right and responsibility to receive full information and to engage in discussion and debate of it before it goes into effect.

Congress, instead, has been glaringly humiliated by learning about it after signing, and then primarily from the press.

U.S. IS BOUND BY IT

Indeed, the treaty already is in effect, even in its unfinished state, through semantic hocus-pocus by the Executive Office. The word, treaty, is replaced by its synonym, agreement. Yet it is binding on the U.S., just as if recognized for what it is, a treaty. As such, it falls within the purview of Congress.

If such procedure is allowed to prevail, it puts the Congress into the category of a sounding board and a rubber stamp, as with the so-called parliaments of communist countries. Congress has the responsibility of demanding that a treaty, under whatever name it passes, be handled as a treaty, or be invalid.

Otherwise this extended capitulation would set the legal precedent for parallel action in Asia, as well as in the Middle East. Withdrawal is not just from Vietnam, but is becoming total retreat.

PERSECUTION OF RUSSIAN JEWS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the Jewish Day of Atonement, Yom Kippur, is the 30th anniversary of the slaughter at Baby Yar of 70,000 Kiev Jews by the Nazis.

What it means to the Jews of Kiev, in the Russian Ukraine, is described by one of them who succeeded in passing his written message to the West beyond the reach of the Soviet security authorities.

Persecution of the Jews in Russia did not end at Baby Yar nor when the Germans were driven out. It continues today. The Jews of the Soviet Union are virtual prisoners. Those who seek to emigrate to Israel or the United States or elsewhere may instead find themselves in jail. Or they may be the objects of other forms of prosecution and persecution, such as losing their job or their home. Their crime is the faith of their fathers. They are unable to practice their religion, read their literature, observe their ancient traditions, and know the richness of their cultural heritage.

The writer of the accompanying article tells what it is to be a Jew in the Soviet Union 30 years after Baby Yar. His message, translated from the original Russian, follows:

"HERE, IN KIEV, BABY YAR HAS BECOME OUR WESTERN WALL"

On September 29, 1941, in Kiev, at Baby Yar, on the eve of the Jewish Holy Day, Yom Kippur, the Germans began the execution of 70 thousand Kiev Jews. September 29 this year again coincides with Yom Kippur. It is a thirtieth anniversary that must be remembered in this Yom Kippur, for Baby Yar will forever remain the symbol of our martyrdom and of the deadly danger threatening Soviet Jewry today. The 30-year-old history of Baby Yar reflects the whole post-war history of that part of our people which is called Soviet Jewry.

At the end of the war and during the first post-war years, Baby Yar remained the living evidence of the horrible catastrophe which overtook the Jewish people during the years of the Second World War. At that time it did not occur to anybody to deny the truth that 70 thousand Jews had been done to death at that place. Indeed, this figure was officially fixed by the Soviet authorities in the materials of the State Commission for Investigation of German crimes in Kiev, and later in the speech of the Public Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R. at the Nuremberg trials. It was even decided to immortalize the memory of Baby Yar, and the Kiev architect Vlasov was engaged in designing the project of such a memorial.

But then came the beginning of the bloody campaign against the Soviet Jews and their culture at the end of the 1940's, when the best representatives of Soviet Jewry were put to death in the torture chambers of Stalin and Beria, when the word Jew disappeared from the everyday vocabulary of the Soviet people, and when the Jewish people itself was supposed to disappear, too, and with them the memory of Baby Yar. For a whole decade the scene of the bloody tragedy was turned into a latrine and into a dump of the city's refuse and sewage. In 1951 it was decided by the authorities to eliminate Baby Yar, to raze everything to the ground and to establish there a sports complex with a stadium and a swimming pool.

The protest of the writer Victor Nekrasov and of the few who supported him, found no attentive ear. The speed of razing Baby Yar was expedited. A strange thing then happened.

In the spring of 1961 Baby Yar became the scene of a new tragedy. The hastily silted soil, moistened further by the spring flood of that year, broke a protective dyke and a deluge came down upon the lower part of the neighboring city of Kurenivka.

"Baby Yar takes revenge"—so said then the people of Kiev.

The desecrated remains of the murdered Jews, the bones and the skulls, suddenly came to the surface from the depths of the earth and froze on the surface of the immobile sand and clay-silted river. This is the Baby Yar the poet Evgeny Yevtushenko saw in the summer of 1961. The poem written by him afterward spread all over the world and caused a profound stir. It was sensed by everyone except the new tormentors of Baby Yar, and was felt by we Soviet Jews. A change of plans was announced: instead of a stadium they promised a recreation park.

The sixties are now called the turning point in the history of Soviet Jewry. During these years the Jews of the U.S.S.R., and Jewish youth in the first place, required consciousness after the numbness and the fear of the previous decades. Step by step, they started to struggle for the restoration of their national rights, for their honor and for their dignity.

The authorities had wanted to force us to forget who we are and what we stand for. We were deprived of our language and our history; deprived of our heroes and martyrs; the names and the graves were taken from us. We had to get all of these back. On September 29, 1966, the Jews of Kiev held their first mass meeting at Baby Yar. This was five years ago, on the 25th anniversary of the massacre.

From that day on Baby Yar has become not only the symbol of the tragedy of the Jewish people and of the profanation of the memory of the fallen; it has become the symbol of our faithfulness to the heritage of our fathers; the symbol of our persistence and resoluteness to uphold our rights and our national dignity.

The speeches of the writers Victor Nekrasov and Ivan Dzuba at that gathering in Baby Yar are evidence of the understanding and the sympathy shown by the democratic public of the Soviet Union with our aspirations as Soviet Jews.

The Soviet authorities became obviously afraid of the consequences. They made urgent efforts to restore some initiative and to neutralize the implications of that assembly of September 29, 1966.

On November 5, 1966 a stone marker was placed at Baby Yar, with a promise to erect there a memorial to the "Soviet citizens, residents of the city of Kiev." Now, every year, a "formal" gathering is held near the spot. But each year the meeting itself, the place and the time of its calling are never communicated to anyone but a narrow circle of people selected specially for this purpose.

Neither on the stone marker nor at these meetings is any mention made of the 70 thousand Jews who perished here. Only a number of specially "commissioined" Jews are annually dragged out to the tribune to dance dutifully to the strangers' orchestration and to abuse to loud applause the "Israeli aggressors."

And even while this is going on the original plan of establishing here a sports complex, which had supposedly been shelved because of the pressure of the government, is now being stubbornly carried through. In the autumn of 1968, on the very eve of the anniversary of Baby Yar, the first stage of the sports facility—a swimming pool, a basketball court and a tennis court—was ceremoniously handed over to the D.C.O. (Voluntary Sports Society), "Vanguard." A football field, although without stands, was erected as far back as 1965. (By grizzly coincidence, after the completion of the executions in 1941, when the tortured bodies were scarcely covered with a thin layer of earth, the Nazi S.S. played football at this very place.)

The provocative and infamous erection of the sports complex in the face of the promise to erect a memorial to the "Soviet citizen" and the "formal" meetings held in Baby Yar each year, can deceive no one, least of

all our Jewish youth. Each year now, on the anniversary of the massacre, the Jewish youth assemble in the evening after work in Baby Yar. In spontaneous tribute, they pay true homage to the memory of their fallen brethren.

The authorities have of course sought to repress this assembly. In 1968 the Kiev engineer Boris Kochubievsky was arrested and later sentenced to three years at a labor camp, for his speech at Baby Yar. Kochubievsky was accused of having dared to speak of thousands of Jews killed in Baby Yar and of having asserted publicly his right to remember it and to speak about it. The Court defined his remarks as anti-Soviet propaganda and Boris Kochubievsky was convicted.

But this severe reprisal, intended to frighten others, had no effect. In 1969 candles suddenly were kindled in the dark all over Baby Yar, and a white-blue Magen David, interwoven with flowers, was laid on the site. The police and the K.G.B. forced the people to blow out the candles and arrested three suspected of having laid the Magen David wreath. This time the authorities limited themselves to extrajudicial repressions. But these too had no effect.

Then, in 1970, an attempt was made to exclude the Jews altogether from Baby Yar. Under various pretexts, an attempt was made to send out of town to other cities everybody who was suspected of participation in the events at Baby Yar. Those young Jews who nevertheless came were met by police cordons and by the K.G.B. in civilian clothes. They tried to prevent the laying of the wreaths with their Hebrew inscriptions. They tore them from the people's hands. But our youths of Kiev showed their defiance and, despite the provocations, paid due homage to Baby Yar. And just as the authorities cannot take our Jewishness away from us, so they cannot take Baby Yar away from us.

That is why in the spring—on "Yom Hazikaron" (Memory Day to the fallen), and in the summer—on the day of *Tisha B'Av*, in the autumn—on the anniversary of the executions and on "Erev Yom Kipur", Jews now come to Baby Yar. We do so with a hope and with the faith in the bright future of our people.

Here, in Kiev, Baby Yar has become our Western Wall, our most cherished place.

On September 29, 1971, Baby Yar will be thirty years old.

REVENUE SHARING: IS THERE A BETTER WAY?

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the concept of general revenue sharing has been much discussed and debated. The Ways and Means Committee has heard extensive public testimony on various facets of revenue sharing.

One of the most unique proposals has come from Lt. Gov. Ed Reinecke of California, a former distinguished member of this august body. I commend to the analysis of my colleagues the Lt. Governor's suggestion of "reverse revenue sharing." It merits much consideration and certainly opens up a whole new area of debate on this issue.

The statement follows:

"REVENUE SHARING: IS THERE A BETTER WAY?" BY LT. GOV. ED REINECKE, CALIFORNIA

The United States today is faced with a continuing conflict between two sets of im-

portant values and beliefs. One philosophical approach urges greater efficiency in government and improvement in public management by greater centralization of governmental power in fewer hands. The other urges dilution and decentralization of political and government power in order to insure democratic control over the exercise of government power, and responsiveness to the will of the people. The latter philosophy holds that people should be allowed and encouraged to solve problems for themselves, and not have the government do everything for them. People should be allowed to develop their full capacities for self-reliance.

This conflict of values is at the heart of the debate over revenue sharing. The allocation of revenues and taxing power determines to a very large extent which of these sets of values we support at any one time. This is because money gives government power. The concentration of this power in the hands of a few national officials has a broad impact. The concentration of power in the hands of many local officials has less impact, but creates greater confidence in the citizen. The static, institutionalized bureaucracies that tend to develop in governments far from the people breed distrust in the citizen, particularly the young citizen.

The American system of a *balanced federalism* was designed to insure our citizens the benefits of both an efficient government able to deal with problems of broad scope, as well as a democratic government, responsive to the will of the people. The genius of the American system of federalism is that it allows for continual readjustment in the balance of governmental powers. This constant state of flux, however, also lends itself to frequent attempts by partners in the system to assert more power. For the last thirty years the national government has exerted itself by taking advantage of the fiscal limitations of states and localities. Only the national government has the power to create money and incur massive debts. Most States and local governments are constitutionally prevented from operating on deficit budgets. With the flow of tax revenues to Washington, D.C. has gone the political power which once resided, close to the people, in their State and local governments.

In the American federal system the States are the pivotal institution. The United States Constitution makes this plain by reserving to the States all powers not specifically and narrowly defined for the national government. The States, in the minds of the authors of the Constitution, were the sovereign units of government. Actual political power rested in them. They delegated certain powers to the national government in the Constitution. And have subsequently delegated certain powers to local governments by state constitution and statute. From the earliest days of colonization the States have been recognized as the legitimate heirs of political power.

It is in the institution of State government that we find the balance between the values which motivate us to seek for a government responsive to the popular will, and at the same time for a government which is powerful enough to cope with public problems in an efficient manner.

The States have failed, however, to exercise their inherent powers. They have become timid and intimidated. It is time that we, as leaders of State government, exert our potential and bring the powers of government back closer to the people.

The present debate over revenue sharing reflects an increased concern over the financial problems of state and local governments. It is recognized that governments need money to operate and provide services desired by the citizen. The proposals now in Congress call for sharing, by the national government, of revenues collected by the Internal Revenue Service, with state and

local governments. Various formulas for allocation are proposed. The President's proposal is for a certain percentage of national revenues to be automatically allocated to states and localities. Another proposal is for the granting of a tax credit applied to federal taxes for all state taxes paid. Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, drawing upon a recommendation of the national Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has urged that the Federal government take over the collection of all state taxes, and simply rebate to the states the revenues which they would have collected for themselves.

In determining methods for sharing revenues it is important that the balance of the federal system be preserved. It would be a serious mistake for the States to be by-passed in any formula for distribution. We must not yield to a solution out of hasty expediency and ignore this opportunity to restore fiscal balance to the system of federalism.

I am proposing a better way to rebalance the federal fiscal system. I urge that we seriously consider reversing the roles of the national and state governments. We should allow the State to take over the collection of all income taxes. The present national income tax system could be combined with the tax systems of the States. Each State would be required to share a portion of its revenues with the United States government. A formula could be worked out to insure that all services which are properly the function of the national government will be supported by adequate revenue sharing from the States. The costs for all other domestic services, such as education, health and welfare, transportation, housing, recreation and environmental quality control, and so on, would then come directly out of the budgets of each State government. This is where the Constitution intended that these problems be solved. The State would have a far superior source of revenue than they do now. We could save billions of dollars now wasted in federal administration of hundreds of grant-in-aid programs. We could keep the revenue dollars close to the people they are supposed to serve instead of sending them far away to Washington, D.C. and they have to fight the bureaucratic red tape to get a little back.

The States have been more active and creative in the tax field than has the national government. States have been forced, because of their present limited revenue base, to raise taxes 410 times in the last decade. During the same period the federal government, because of its superior tax base, actually reduced taxes five times. Forty-four states have some form of income taxation, and would be able immediately to assume responsibility for collection of the income tax now going to the national government. The other States are now debating legislation to impose income taxes.

State income tax systems are already completely coordinated with the federal system in most states. Information on federal and state income tax returns is computerized and is easily exchanged between jurisdictions. The State of California tax system is every bit as efficient as the Internal Revenue Service. IRS personnel are now located in every State. Their expertise could be phased into a state collection operation very easily. Auditing of tax returns could be done by a single state agency, instead of the duplicative system we now have.

Proponents for the federal government-to-state government revenue sharing plans argue that because of the superior revenue of the federal government (they collect 93 percent of all income taxes) their proposal is the better way. However, the superior revenue system of the federal government is really a very major part of the problem of fiscal imbalance in the system, and not part of the

solution. So long as the national government continues to occupy the vast majority of the tax field and usurp the revenues, the States and localities will continue to lag behind. The federal system will continue out of balance. Political power will continue to gravitate to Washington, D.C. at the expense of the States, the local governments, and the people. And the social problems of our day will continue to go substantially unsolved.

By returning the taxing power to the States, we will be returning political power to the people, and with it the power to solve their own social problems. Support for all other American social action agencies, like our churches and charitable organizations, comes from the people. These institutions are close to those who support them. Our government should be the same.

Chairman Wilbur Mills has expressed his opposition to federal-to-state revenue sharing because, he asserts, it separates the power to tax from the power to spend. The federal government would continue to tax, and the State would spend under the President's revenue sharing plan. My proposal for reverse revenue sharing would keep these two powers in the same hands, closer to the people. The States would both tax and spend.

As noted above, Mr. Mills has proposed that the federal government take over the collection of all state taxes as well as all federal taxes. He argues that this is primarily a move for greater government efficiency. With 100 percent of all income tax revenues in its hands, how long would it be before the federal government began imposing conditions and guidelines on the turn of the funds collected for the States? The experience of the poorly administered federal categorical grant programs must serve as a warning of what could happen. Since Chairman Mills believes that the power to tax and spend should be in the same level of government, it would appear that he is proposing a vast expansion of the federal government functions, at the expense of the States.

My proposal for revenue sharing by the States would mean more money for each State and its subdivisions. Under the revenue sharing proposal now in the Congress there is only an assurance that no State will receive less than it is now receiving in federal grants-in-aid. There is no attempt to provide more revenues to States or localities. For most States this is not much help. For example, in California, the total federal aid for the State, local governments and individuals in fiscal year 1969 was \$2.8 billion. Yet, Californians paid the federal government in fiscal year 1969 \$16.8 billion in taxes.

Under my proposal States would be in a much better position to aid their local governments financially. The present system of local governments dealing directly with the federal government creates serious problems of intergovernmental relations. The maze of federal regulations imposed by bureaucrats on recipients of grants could be eliminated. When the States share their revenues with the political subdivisions, only State law enacted by the elected legislature should apply and govern the recipients. In our State, 67 percent of the budget in fiscal year 1970 was allocated to local units of government. This amounted to \$4.8 billion. That is nearly a third of the whole revenue sharing program proposed for the entire country.

The seriousness of our present situation of fiscal imbalance is well illustrated by a comment made recently in a U.S. Treasury Department report issued at the request of a Senator. The report listed various deductions allowed to taxpayers on their income tax returns. It then concluded that these deductions "cost the government \$44 billion last year".

The remarkable arrogance of this remark is an indication of the power which the national government presumes as its own. The

deductions which taxpayers take on the tax returns do not cost the federal government anything because it is not the government's money in the first place. The money belongs to the ordinary people in this country who did the work to earn it. To say that these deductions are a cost to the government assumes that all the money belongs to the government.

The situation is really the other way around. The government is a huge cost to the public, for which it does not get value received. By returning the taxing and spending power of government to the States, where the people can keep a closer control on its use, we can assure a balanced, effective, and responsive system of government at a lower cost to the citizen.

Let us be courageous enough to face squarely the basic problem and not simply look for a one or two percent solution for the sake of momentary expediency. To decentralize the political and fiscal power now centralized in Washington, D.C. is to give greater reality to the democratic principles on which this republic was founded.

JIM HERRIMAN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to reflect on a distinguished career Federal worker who is retiring on November 1, after 32 years of public service with the U.S. Department of Labor.

James L. Herriman leaves the Government as Director of Policy and Procedures in the Office of Wage and Employment Standards of the Wage and Hour Division.

It is often that we fail to note the unselfish and dedicated Federal worker—the one who completes not only appointed and required tasks with dispatch and efficiency but goes the "extra mile" to perform services with compassion and effectiveness.

Such an employee is Jim Herriman. His outstanding record deserves recognition not because it is expected or wanted but because it is deserved and should be recognized as an example for others who aspire to truly dedicated public service.

A native of Granite, Colo., he is a graduate of Washington University in St. Louis. He entered Government service with the Labor Department's Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division in 1939 as an investigator in San Antonio, Tex.

Except for a 6-year stint as a staff sergeant during World War II with the 4th Armored Division in the European theater of operations, Mr. Herriman has remained with the Department of Labor.

Following military service, he held positions of field office supervisor in the Department's Dallas regional office and also served as Assistant to the Regional Director in both Dallas and Chicago.

From 1959 to 1963, he served as director of the San Juan area office with jurisdiction in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Panama Canal Zone.

During that time he was responsible

for the planning, direction, and coordination of the administration and enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and Walsh-Healy Public Contracts Act. He also supervised staff work for the industry wage order program and provided services to the Tripartite Industry Committee, which had been appointed by the Secretary of Labor to recommend Wage rates for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

His dedication to duty at this post was coupled with an unequalled ability, utilized to its utmost for the betterment of Government service. Such a combination—unflagging devotion to duty and an uncanny mental capacity—is the record of his work in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Herriman returned to Dallas in 1963 as Deputy Regional Director, a position he held for 2 years prior to his assignment in Washington.

During the past 6 years, he has been responsible for the development, maintenance, implementation, and evaluation program for enforcement of the labor standards laws. This work affects enforcement activities in some 10 regional offices and covers additionally more than 100 area offices and over 1,000 compliance officers.

To this new assignment he carried know-how and enthusiasm and under his guidance labor regulations met the challenge of unparalleled growth in this country.

His incisive mind served him well while he unraveled the tangled knots of the seemingly irreconcilable forces of labor and management. Yet, at the same time, he always has been a warm, personable human being devoted to his family and his church.

Jim Herriman has chosen voluntarily to leave the ranks of the Federal Government and we shall miss him for the good qualities he takes with him.

I am proud to report that Mr. Herriman and his lovely wife, Vivian, who has been an includable member of our own staff, plan to return to Texas to make their home in my district.

Mr. Herriman is my friend as well as a real gentleman and a truly great American. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for the unselfish contributions he has made to our way of life and to this country.

AMENDMENT TO OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BILL

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer an amendment to the Office of Economic Opportunity bill which would permit the Director to utilize an additional \$50 million for new programs to serve the poor, particularly the invisible elderly poor, who are being pathetically underserved by the current program.

Support for an amendment of this type can be found in the testimony of Mr. William C. Fitch before the Committee

on Education and Labor. As executive director of the National Council on the Aging, a voluntary nonprofit agency which helps to develop programs and services on behalf of and with the elderly, Mr. Fitch is particularly well-qualified to speak of the needs of our senior citizens. I commend Mr. Fitch's testimony to my colleague and I hope that they will support my amendment.

The text of Mr. Fitch's testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM G. FITCH

I am William C. Fitch, Executive Director of the National Council on the Aging. I am accompanied by Mr. Jack Ossosky, the Council's Deputy Director, who coordinates our various projects, including one for the Office of Economic Opportunity. We are pleased once again to have the opportunity to appear before your Committee and to participate in its deliberations.

For those who may not know, permit me to say that our organization is a voluntary non-profit agency serving public and private groups at the National, Regional, State and Local levels in the development of programs and services on behalf of and with the elderly. We are a technical agency made up of concerned people from various disciplines working with the elderly. We provide training, technical assistance, materials and consultation to groups seeking to know more about, and to improve the conditions of life of the elderly. We have been in operation for twenty years.

The subject matter of this hearing is of vital concern to us, and to the elderly on whose behalf we work. The future of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the scope of its mission, the size of its budget, its place in the Federal establishment are matters of great importance to the elderly and to our nation. So are its specific programs which are or need to be directed at the poor who are old.

That the elderly have a stake in the future of our nation's antipoverty efforts is readily understandable from an examination of those who make up the poor. While most studies indicate that the number of those in poverty decreased in recent years, all studies agree that Americans aged 65 and older increased among the poor. The Senate's Special Committee on Aging in its report, "Economics of Aging" declared that between 1968 and 1969, poverty increased among those 65 and over by 200,000, and by some 12,000 for those from 60 to 64.

While the elderly constitute not quite one out of every ten Americans, they make up 20 percent of all the poor. Close to five million Americans 65 and older were living in poverty in 1969. There are no indications that this trend will soon abate.

While the cures of poverty of the elderly, those poor who have grown old and those old who have grown poor, relate to circumstances often beyond the resources and control of the Office of Economic Opportunity, it is nonetheless fair to look for leadership from this agency in fighting the war on poverty in this sector too. It is fair, too, to examine the portion of its resources devoted to dealing with the needs of the elderly and those approaching their senior years. (If we include those age 55 and above we find that they represent one-third of all the poor.) It is important in approaching the future of this agency to see if it has given adequate priority to this group and also whether or not the Congress gave the agency the wherewithal with which to do the needed job.

NCOA is in a unique position to participate in this discussion. During the last six and a half years NCOA has served as an OEO contractor providing technical assistance, training and consultation to the agency. We have

worked closely with the agency at all levels, including the local level helping assess needs, developing programs and seeking sources of funds for those programs. We have assisted in developing many of OEO's innovative projects and have on occasion conducted such projects.

We value our opportunity to serve OEO, and at the same time we value our role as an independent voluntary agency concerned with the elderly. Both privately and publicly we credit OEO with its successes and are critical of its weaknesses. Our goal is to be constructive and to enable this agency to best serve the elderly. Our comments today are made in that spirit.

Since its inception the elderly who make up a maxi-portion of the poor have received a mini-portion of the funds and resources of the OEO. The reasons for this are varied. Some of the early OEO pioneers, and some who are there today, felt that the purpose of the agency was to break the cycle of poverty for the young; that it was too late to do so for the old. This argument we consider immoral. It coldly dumps the elderly on society's scrap heap and overlooks the fact that those turning 65 may have 14-16 or more years of life ahead of them. It overlooks the fact that the elderly can contribute, often wish to work, and need to be seen as a national resource—not only as a problem. It overlooks, too, the fact that someone, sooner or later, must pay for creating a scrap heap, whether in terms of environmental ecology or human ecology.

Others at OEO and some in the Congress felt that the major problems of the elderly were financial and could be dealt with only through increased social security, old age assistance and the like. While there is some merit to giving priority to meeting the income needs of the elderly, this argument overlooks the fact that some of those needs can be met through employment, of the type created and tested in antipoverty programs for younger groups—and in some cases for the elderly. This argument also overlooks the fact that in dealing with poverty, money is the major medicine but not the only one. Services, social services, health services, community outreach; linkages to other agencies, educational and social programs, and transportation and nutrition programs; these, too, are needed by the elderly and these are areas in which OEO can play a major role on behalf of the older poor. In time, under the terms of the SOS section of the law, but with limited funds, OEO began to deal with these matters.

It must, however, be noted that the low priority for the elderly in the programs developed by OEO was not totally the fault of that agency. The Congress in writing the legislation, and later amending it, gave first no emphasis to the elderly, and then emphasis, but no appreciable funds for these efforts. Consequently the earmarks, when they were made for the Senior Opportunity and Services Program, as an example, started with about 2 million dollars and rose only slowly to 6.8 million. Now the request is for some 8 million dollars. While the elderly benefit to some extent, it is hard to document the extent, from other OEO intergenerational programs in the areas of health, employment, legal services, etc. The fact remains that out of some 2 billion dollars in the whole appropriation, only some 8 million is sought for clearly identifiable programs to serve one-third of all the poor, the elderly.

We would urge therefore that the past history of OEO in the field of aging is not solely the fault of the agency's administrators. We, the citizens and the Congress left it to the agency to carve out roles and funds for the elderly, often at a time when major portions of those funds were earmarked for other purposes or were being curtailed.

We would urge therefore that a clearer

Congressional mandate be given to OEO to enable it to live up to the requirements already in the Act. We believe this can be done only with the allocation of clearly identifiable funds for programs for the elderly; new funds not taken from other sections of the OEO budget that would undermine other programs of the agency. New funds which can be used only to fund new programs for the elderly.

Now it is true that many Community Action Agencies developed special programs for the elderly out of their local initiative funds. Many of these proposals were rejected at the regional level because, they said, aging had no priority. Mind you, these were locally developed programs. In other instances, in the last two years in particular, SOS funds were often used to pay for aging projects previously established using local initiative dollars. This resulted in an apparent use of the SOS funds but in no new programs. It served to ease the dollar pressures of the CAA's whose other funds were being curtailed. We believe this to have been encouraged by OEO and to have been contrary to Congressional intent.

It is for these reasons, too, that we emphasize an adequate start in funding SOS programs with clear language that cannot be misunderstood; that this new money is only for new programs.

We believe, from reports of our own staff around the country that there are now "ready and in the pipeline" proposals for aging programs, and new ones which are being developed that would require a 50 million dollar earmark. This figure is based on projects currently in CAA's, some submitted to OEO regional offices but not funded, due to lack of funds or lack of priority, as well as an assessment of needs in communities visited by our staff and others.

This figure would not change the balance of funding for the aging completely, but would make it possible for OEO to start correcting an inequity in the coming fiscal year, and provide a base on which to build in the second year.

Now the question presents itself: is OEO capable of putting such funds to proper use? We believe that it is. In fact, it is perhaps a minor miracle that in spite of all the obstacles and the lack of resources, as much has happened on behalf of the elderly as has. Many of us tend to overlook in the flood of concern about this agency's operations and its future, that it developed and undertook such programs as Medicare Alert, which signed up over 4 million older people in the Medicare Program in a few short months, employing 14,500 older people to do so, and involving 20,000 volunteers. We overlook the Foster Grandparent Program with its employment of thousands of older people and service to thousands more of the more disabled children. Many of the model programs funded by other agencies, public and private, stemmed from OEO R & D programs and that even the mainstream, Senior Service Corps and Green Thumb projects, were OEO programs delegated to the Department of Labor.

Recent studies of the SOS programs point to the fact that local community Action Agencies when given a green light to serve the elderly, when aided by competent technical assistance, and when notified that some funds would be forthcoming have undertaken to serve their older residents. Some have used local initiative funds for this purpose, but as those funds are reduced most have used SOS funds to finance their aging projects.

Our work with the Community Action Agencies has convinced us of this willingness to innovate, to launch significant new programs and to make careful assessments of needs prior to seeking new projects. And the needs have been documented time and again. Our own study for OEO, Project FIND, in which we subcontracted with 12 CAA's to

employ older people and interview the elderly poor documented the vast needs to this sector of the population. We are pleased to submit a copy of that report to the Committee. Most of those needs and most of the new services fall readily into the language of the Senior Opportunities and Services section of the Act.

The major obstacle to implementing these services is lack of funds.

Our own experience in the delivery of training and technical assistance underscores the growing interest of CAA's in serving the older poor. In the year 1970, for example, our agency under its contract with OEO provided training to 9,241 staff, board and clients of OEO. In addition we provided assistance to 528 different agencies during this same year.

Much of this training and assistance related to finding non-OEO sources of support for programs for the older poor because so little was available in SOS budgets and because local initiative funds were being cut back. There is evidence, too, that the SOS funds attract a higher proportion of non-Federal share than any other programs of OEO.

This is a reflection of the fact that programs for the elderly run by CAA's gain more public support than other programs. The investment of Federal dollars in aging programs through the CAA's, if this pattern can be maintained, can offer a higher return in other support, and more good will for this Federal effort than other such programs.

Of course, to make proper use of new funds and even to assure equitable involvement of the elderly in present programs a reexamination of OEO's staffing of aging programs is needed. At present, the Assistant Director of OEO, who we believe is earnestly attempting to change the Agency's posture in this field, is nonetheless wearing several additional hats. The Legislative history, we believe, makes it clear that the Congress intended that the Assistant Director be responsible for supervising the OEO activities in the field of aging and coordinating the whole Federal effort on behalf of the older poor.

The assistant Director's task, as it was recently reorganized, includes four different areas of OEO concern, including aging. There is also no evidence that any significant attempt has been made to stimulate and coordinate Government-wide efforts on behalf of the older poor.

Secondly, the total staff devoted to serving one-third of the nation's poor and seeing they get a fair share of all OEO's programs consists of four people at the headquarters level in addition to the Assistant Director, and some of these are also saddled with other responsibilities. In each regional office there is only one coordinator of aging programs, who also invariably wears several other hats.

This staff of perhaps 15 people, most of them with other responsibilities, represents the total OEO aging staff. Compare this with the hundreds deployed to start the Head Start Program when priority and funds were made available for pre-school age children. This not to be critical of the Head Start effort, it is rather to place in juxtaposition the two extremes of the age continuum and how we regard them and serve them at OEO and in the Congress.

In presenting its concerns regarding adequate attention and funds for the elderly, NCOA is not unaware of the other issues confronting this Committee and the nation regarding the future of OEO. We believe OEO can, given the resources, do an even better job, but we are not among those who believe that the agency has not made a major contribution to all of our understanding about poverty and to improve the lives of many of the poor including many of the older poor.

The new concepts evolved by OEO regarding outreach by public and private agencies; the emphasis on local citizen participation

in policymaking roles; the sharing of common concerns and joining in constructive community action by the most deprived; the new careers concept and others are concepts and programs pioneered by OEO. Some of the new approaches made many people uncomfortable at times; some actions on occasion went beyond their goals, but on the whole, we believe they contributed well to the American scene. Indeed the R & D function of OEO when tied to a significant operating agency, made a healthy and lasting impact on America, one that requires support and continuity. Till now we've only laid the foundation.

Even in the field of aging is this true. No other branch of government undertook so many new approaches to seek ways of reaching and serving the older poor. In spite of limited staff and in spite of low priority and lack of funds, the aging scene has benefitted from the needed changes and new approaches OEO pioneered. When most other agencies were prepared to continue to brush the older poor, the most isolated and needy under the rug, the OEO message about priority for the poor jarred them into recognizing that old approaches to the old were no longer acceptable. OEO's role, prodding us and leading us to double our efforts on behalf of the poor, must be maintained and its efforts on behalf of the older poor strengthened.

We have mentioned conducting one major R & D project for OEO documenting the needs of the older poor. Its report called "The Golden Years . . . A Tarnished Myth," describes the conditions of life of over 50,000 older people, most of them poor. Other older poor people were trained to interview and assist them. That report notes many kinds of programs that are needed and can be developed to serve the older poor, like those located by Project FIND. However, if the results of an R & D project can't get translated into operations, tested further on a larger scale and then where appropriate spun off, the results of the R & D will be wasted. There is regrettably much evidence of this to be found in other aging programs where R & D is far separated from operations or because no budget exists to implement what has been learned. We urge that Community Action and other operating arms not be severed from the agency but be the means of assuring implementation of the R & D findings.

Furthermore, we firmly believe that the advocacy role of OEO should not be lost. We, in the voluntary sector, see this as an appropriate role for ourselves, but we also see the validity of a government spokesman, a special pleader if you will, for national priorities. And such a priority must be the elimination of poverty.

Again in the field of aging, who is to speak in government for the most deprived of the elderly? The Administration on Aging sees its role as working for all the elderly and thereby giving no special priority in most matters to the older poor. In addition, that agency is itself undergoing major budget and structural surgery. We see a proper role for OEO to work and speak on behalf of the older poor and we would like to see that role strengthened rather than weakened.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we urge you on behalf of the senior community service aides employed through OEO's efforts in community service roles in Portland, Oregon; in Portland, Maine; in San Antonio, Texas; and in Paintsville, Kentucky, to strengthen OEO's programs so they can employ and serve more of the elderly in more places. We urge you on behalf of SOS participants in the far-flung counties of Missouri who enjoy transportation services to health facilities, who work in now self-supporting home health agencies, who have a senior center to attend and who

get a home delivered meal at low cost as a result of OEO programs, to support more such services for the older poor in other parts of the nation. And we urge you on behalf of voluntary agencies all over the nation to maintain and expand our nation's efforts to eliminate and alleviate poverty, and not to let the achievements of the last seven years go to waste. Let us improve what needs improving. Let us build on this effort.

Specifically, we urge the continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity for at least two more years. We urge the appropriation and earmarking of \$50 million for new programs for the older poor. We urge that adequate full-time staffing at national and regional levels be provided for the units dealing with aging. We recommend that steps be taken to assure that the elderly are equitably served by all OEO programs and that clear priority be given to service to the elderly so that local communities wishing to serve them are enabled to do so. We would urge the Office of Program Development to design and test new ways of meeting the needs of the elderly and that successful projects then be built into the ongoing programs of the Office of Operations.

Most important of all, keep this agency going, to give hope to America's poor that they will not be abandoned.

IMF TO DEVALUATE POPULATION AS WELL AS DOLLARS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, most of us felt that the International Monetary Fund, which is presently meeting in Washington, was primarily involved in devaluation of the U.S. dollar. Few realize that the international bankers were also interested in devaluation of the U.S. population.

Strange as it may seem, Robert Strange McNamara's World Bank reported to the IMF that its activities in the promotion and financing of birth control policies—which must necessarily include sex education, abortion, and other perverse activities—have slowed population growth in the U.S.

And the American people will have no more control over the buying power of their money—the fruit of their toil and savings—than they will over the sanctity of their home and the minds and bodies of their own children so long as we tolerate the rape of our institutions by these international one-world socialist regulators.

I include pertinent newsclippings, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 28, 1971]

U.S. SLOWS UP—POPULATION GROWTH UNABATED OVERSEAS
(By Robert Dietsch)

Population growth has slowed in the United States but the "people boom" continues unabated overseas even tho a growing number of countries officially have adopted birth-control policies.

A World Bank study showed today that the population of poor countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America "will continue to grow rapidly for several decades, perhaps . . . reach-

ing nearly 10 billion." Other studies show that the populations of most developed countries also continue to grow relatively rapidly.

In the United States, however, recent studies show young couples are having fewer children than usual and the population growth rate may approach zero by the turn of the century.

World Bank President Robert McNamara told the bank's annual meeting yesterday that even if couples in poor countries limit their families to two children each, by the year 2040 the populations of those countries will total nearly 14 billion, compared to 2.6 billion today. The entire world population today is an estimated 3.4 billion.

Mr. McNamara, defense secretary in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, said when he took the World Bank post in 1968 that the international lending institution would help member nations with family planning.

But since then, the bank has made only three loans in the population control field, two to Trinidad and Tobago and one to Tunisia. These loans total \$10 million. The bank's overall loans last year alone totaled \$1.9 billion.

However, the bank is processing about six more family planning loans, including one to India.

More than 22 poor countries now have adopted official population planning policies. Mr. McNamara called this trend encouraging, but he conceded: "Only in a handful of developing countries is the population perceived by the top political leadership as a matter of high priority. It is in part due to the absence of strong political support that the measurable effect to date of population planning programs on fertility rates is insignificant."

The continuing rapid growth of population in poor countries aggravates the food and malnutrition problem. The Food and Agricultural Organization, a UN agency, has estimated that more than 300 million children from the poorer countries suffer what the agency called "grossly retarded physical growth."

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 28, 1971]

NEW MONEY SETUP PROPOSED, DOWNGRADING DOLLAR'S ROLE (By Lee M. Cohn)

A new international monetary system downgrading the role of the dollar was proposed today by finance ministers of the leading nations.

Instead of relying on dollars as monetary reserves, the system would shift gradually to special drawing rights—artificial reserves issued by the International Monetary Fund.

By controlling the volume of special drawing rights (SDRs), the IMF could evolve into a world central bank, operating at the international level as the Federal Reserve Board operates in influencing the U.S. economy.

The outline of a consensus of overhauling the monetary system began to emerge in speeches at the second session of the annual joint meeting of the IMF and the World Bank.

In addition to presenting their ideas for long-range monetary reform, the finance ministers joined in urging prompt negotiations to settle the immediate monetary crisis by realigning currency values and removing the surcharge—additional tariff—imposed on imports by President Nixon.

Delay could be disastrous for the world economy, they said. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, France's finance minister, warned that the world may be heading into a recession, partly because of monetary disorder.

Giscard and most of the other speakers called on the United States to join in the realignment of currencies by directly devaluing the dollar through an increase in the

official price of gold, instead of insisting that other countries handle the whole job by raising their currency values.

WARN OF PROTECTIONISM

All the speakers warned that the import surcharge and other U.S. measures aimed at reducing the U.S. trade deficit have created the danger of escalating protectionism throughout the world as other countries try to protect their positions.

"The cumulative spreading of respective trade practices would be a disaster for all of us," warned Edgar J. Benson, Canada's finance minister.

In an obvious dig at the United States, Benson said: "Even those who depend relatively little on world trade could not escape the widespread frustration and political turmoil that would be spawned by a shrinking of world commerce."

Anthony Barber, Britain's chancellor of the exchequer, presented the most detailed proposals for a new system in which SDRs—nicknamed paper gold—would largely supplant the dollar in monetary reserves.

The IMF began to issue SDRs in 1969 to supplement dollars and gold in international reserves. Countries need reserves to settle balance of payments deficits, and to support the value of their currencies.

The new system being discussed would greatly enlarge the role of SDRs. The role of the dollar would be limited primarily to commercial transactions and intervention to exchange markets.

This curtailed role for the dollar would reduce the economic dominance of the United States in the world, and would enforce discipline on the U.S. balance of payments, because it no longer would be so easy to spend and invest more abroad than could be earned from foreign sources.

However, there might not be much effect on the economic situation of average Americans.

Barber observed that many experts believe it would be "desirable to move away from the use of national currencies as reserve assets, and that the way forward lies in the development of the SDR."

"The SDR could become the main asset in which countries hold their reserves," he said. "Eventually—it would no doubt take time—the SDR could become the major element, with currency holdings largely confined to working balances."

Referring to the potential evolution of the IMF as a central bank, Barber said the SDR system would require "the controlled creation of adequate but not excessive world liquidity (money and credit) without reliance on the deficit position of one or more countries."

The Federal Reserve Board in the United States and central banks in other countries have as their main responsibility just such control of money and credit.

U.S. DEFICITS BLAMED

Barber's reference to reducing reliance on the deficits of particular countries was an allusion to the present system, in which U.S. balance of payments deficits provide dollars for the reserves of other countries.

There now is universal agreement that chronic U.S. deficits have flooded the world with dollars and must be reduced. This has led to the search for new reserves that could be controlled cooperatively.

If the system is shifted from dollars to SDRs, Barber said, a procedure will be needed to retire existing dollar reserves.

He suggested creation of an SDR account in the IMF. Dollars would be deposited in the IMF in exchange for issuance of SDRs.

The SDR also would serve as the denominator for par values of currencies, Barber said. That is, the German mark, the British pound, the U.S. dollar and other currencies would be defined as so many SDRs or some fraction of an SDR.

COULD CHANGE PARITY

The dollar has served as the denominator for par values, and the dollar in turn has been linked to gold through the U.S. offer to buy and sell gold at the fixed price of \$35 an ounce. But this system has broken down because President Nixon has suspended gold sales, and most currency values now are fluctuating—or floating—in market trading.

If SDRs served as the denominator, Barber said, the United States would be able to change the dollar's parity in the same way as other countries can change the value of their currencies.

With SDRs gradually becoming the main monetary reserve, he said, the dollar and other national currencies still would be used for ordinary commerce and for intervention in markets to stabilize par values. He said the role of currencies other than the dollar for these purposes might grow.

U.S. officials also have discussed the possibility of a greater role for SDRs and a diminished role for the dollar, but they have not spelled out details or committed themselves.

Treasury Secretary John B. Connally postponed his policy speech until tomorrow or Thursday. He and other U.S. officials are probing the bargaining positions of the other nations in bilateral talks during the meeting.

Giscard, the French finance minister, was less explicit than Barber in discussing monetary reform, but he did cautiously suggest an enlarged role for SDRs.

He proposed "a composition of international liquidities which would, together with gold, assign a diminishing role to reserve currencies and a growing one to what I will term 'objective liquidities,' such as SDRs."

ASKS END TO FLOATERS

Mario Ferrari-Agradi of Italy and Mikio Mizuta of Japan joined in proposing some form of SDR system to reduce the role of the dollar and make the world economy less susceptible to American policies.

All the speakers from leading countries urged an early end to floating currencies and a return to relatively fixed par values. But there was general agreement that, after new parities are established, currency values should be allowed to fluctuate in market trading within somewhat wider margins than the 1 percent above and below par permitted by IMF rules.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 1971]
MONETARY CHIEFS URGE FAST ACTION ON DOLLAR: IMF LEADERS TOLD DELAY HITS POOR NATIONS

(By Frank C. Porter)

Poor nations could be losers if the wealthier countries don't put their monetary house in order fast, and massive efforts beyond this are needed to keep them from falling back further during the Second Development Decade.

This was the dual warning brought before the top financial and economic leaders of 118 nations yesterday by Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, and Robert S. McNamara, president of the World Bank.

Attention had been riveted on the big powers over the weekend. On Sunday the United States and nine other industrialized nations softened their positions unexpectedly and took the big first step toward resolving the money impasse touched off by President Nixon's New Economic Policy on Aug. 15.

Thus, ironically, the big news of the Bank and Fund's 26th annual meeting occurred before it even got under way yesterday morning.

If the less developed countries (LDCs in economists' jargon) had felt neglected they could squirm yesterday under the spotlight

of McNamara's gloomy prognosis of increasing overpopulation, malnutrition, unemployment and maldistribution of income among two thirds of the world's people.

"And the lesson of the last decade (the First Development Decade) has been that we cannot simply depend on economic growth alone to solve these problems," said McNamara, who served as Defense Secretary under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Americans who fret about an unemployment rate of 6 per cent could also squirm as McNamara estimated the unemployment rate at 20 to 25 per cent in the poorer nations—about the peak U.S. rate during the Great Depression of the 1930s.

McNamara counseled programs of population planning, an attack on malnutrition, agrarian reform, reordering of policies that presently favor the rich at the expense of the poor, stepped-up foreign aid, and a dramatic increase in the exports of manufactured goods by the poorer countries.

Schweitzer stressed the urgency of swiftly forging a new and stable monetary order to replace the one that died when Mr. Nixon decided to cut the dollar's ties to gold.

With fixed exchange rates gone and currencies now floating in value, the protective restrictions being erected daily by individual nations may be progressively harder to dismantle, thereby making a solution all the more difficult, he said.

Schweitzer said he is particularly concerned about the impact of the present situation on the poorer nations.

"The present exchange-rate uncertainties add a new and serious impediment to the development efforts of these countries, which also must contend with the effects of the U.S. import surcharge and the cuts in U. S. aid," he said.

"All this is not an auspicious beginning for the Second Development Decade, when developing countries have the task of finding new avenues of productive employment for their growing populations."

Once again, Schweitzer exhorted "all the major countries involved" to make "a contribution" to the realignment of currencies so that they will have an appropriate relationship to gold "and, what is perhaps more important, to SDRs and reserve positions in the Fund."

SDRs are the special drawing rights, or "paper gold," created by the IMF several years ago to supplement gold and major currencies for settling accounts among nations and to serve as reserve assets.

Since the value of SDRs is fixed in terms of gold and since the price of monetary gold is pegged to the dollar (at \$35 an ounce), as the dollar falls in value in relation to other currencies such as the mark and the yen, so would the value of SDRs.

This is what Schweitzer fears. So his remarks yesterday served as yet another prod to the United States to increase the price of gold to maintain the value of SDRs—a move this country has so far resisted.

U. S. Treasury Secretary John B. Connally Jr., who had distressed other finance ministers with his unyielding position in London only 10 days ago, called "the present situation an unparalleled opportunity for constructive initiative."

In brief welcoming remarks to the 1,200 Bank and Fund governors, alternates, advisers and observers, Connally said he would not minimize the dangers in what some regard as a time of crisis.

But "if we but seize the historic chance that we now have, we can build a financial system as well adapted for the next quarter century as our predecessors at Bretton Woods built for the quarter century just concluded," he said.

THEME ECHOED

The theme was echoed by Karl A. Schiller, West Germany's minister for economic affairs
CXVII—2126—Part 26

and finance, and co-chairman of the boards of governors for the Bank and Fund.

"A major jolt of this nature can act as a powerful catalyst for comprehensive reform," he said. "In the clouds that have gathered in recent weeks, this possibility of creating a fully viable international monetary structure may be seen as a silver lining—or perhaps I should rather say a lining in SDRs."

But Schiller also had sobering words about the plight of the undeveloped world:

"The standard of living . . . still in alarmingly low. The fight against hunger and protein deficiency is still far from being won. Life expectancy in developing countries continues to be low, infant mortality rate high. Unemployment and underemployment have increased. Distribution of incomes and property is widely unsatisfactory. The share of developing countries in world exports is declining."

McNamara later filled in some chilling statistics:

Even if the developing countries were able to reduce births to an average of two per couple in 50 years, their present population of 2.6 billion would increase nearly fourfold to almost 10 billion. But only in a handful of developing countries is the population problem perceived by top political leadership as a matter of high priority."

About one of every five babies in large areas of India dies in its first year and the proportion of children who die between one and two years of age in the United Arab Republic is more than 100 times higher than in Sweden. Beyond this malnutrition in those who survive stunts physical and mental growth, reduces adult productivity and is a major barrier to human and economic development.

"And yet, despite the evidence that with a relatively small per capita expenditure of resources major gains can be achieved, there is scarcely a nation in the developing world where a concerted attack on the problem is under way."

The First Development Decade was successful in aggregate terms with developing countries exceeding the target of an annual growth on real gross national product of 5 per cent. But the increase was so unequally distributed among countries, regions and people "that it has finally created a reaction against growth as the primary development objective and a demand for greater attention to employment and income distribution."

Most public investment in the poorer countries favors urban areas, and in the neglected rural areas the bigger and richer farmers get most of the assistance. Land reform is justified not just for equity reasons but because smaller farms can be more efficient—if their owners get the necessary help.

THE CHIEF STEPS DOWN

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of America's great Indian leaders, Chief W. E. "Dode" McIntosh of the Creek Indian Tribe, recently stepped down from office after serving for 10 years as one of the most eloquent and dedicated spokesmen for America's first citizens.

Chief McIntosh is a longtime personal friend, and I can think of no single individual in our Nation who has done more to advance the cause of the American Indian. A man of great sincerity and dedication, Chief McIntosh has always

worked to achieve solutions to the problems of his people, and he has worked toward this end with singular energy and perseverance.

Tulsa Tribune State Editor Mac Bartlett recently paid a glowing tribute to the life and accomplishments of Chief McIntosh, and I include Mr. Bartlett's story at this point in the RECORD:

THE CHIEF STEPS DOWN

(By Mac Bartlett)

The Chief has stepped down, but don't count him out.

The 78-year-old Waldo Emerson (Dode) McIntosh, head of the Creeks for 10 years, has waged too many battles in behalf of his—and other—tribes to turn his back on future Indian programs.

"I have worn out five Buicks and one Dodge trying to help the Creeks," the peripatetic Tulsan remarked recently.

He omitted, however, reference to frequent air trips, many at his own expense, to fight for Indian causes in Congress or before top officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

He neglected also to mention his hours spent writing or telephoning government men, soliciting their aid for the "First Americans."

The chief admittedly is tired of "looking after 40,000 or more" Creeks and their financial problems. He has listened patiently to their troubles and has vigorously sought solutions.

Next month he is shifting leadership to Claude A. Cox, 58, of Okmulgee. Cox was elected to a four-year term Tuesday and will be installed Oct. 7.

"The Chief," born in Tennessee, was the youngest of four sons of A. G. (Chessie) McIntosh, the first Indian lawyer permitted to practice in federal courts.

The father gave all his sons nicknames and "Dode" was the moniker—with no significant meaning—that he passed on to the youngest. "Dode" is half Creek, half Scot.

The father came to Indian Territory in 1901 to practice law and to serve as tribal superintendent for the Creeks and Seminoles. Later he became superintendent of public schools in McIntosh County, named for the McIntosh family.

From his boyhood days in Checotah until the present, "Dode" McIntosh has pursued a wide variety of jobs.

Graduate of Checotah High School and Eu-faula Normal School, the Tulsan became a \$65-a-month school teacher. Old-timers may recall the slightly built young teacher who traveled several miles daily by horseback to the "Snowdrop School," six miles north of the present site of Fountainhead Lodge.

He recalled "Teaching the ABCs and through the seventh grade" for two years.

Next he ran for and was elected city clerk of Checotah, a job which paid \$75 monthly.

World War I interrupted the tribesman's city service. He became a first sergeant in the infantry.

From 1924 until 1942 when he moved to Tulsa, McIntosh worked as a lumberyard manager, as a real estate salesman and as an insurance man at Miami, Okla. He is a former Democratic chairman in Ottawa County where he became acquainted with many Oklahoma political figures as they conducted statewide campaigns.

Moving to Tulsa as a district manager for the old Home Owners Loan Corp., "Dode" widened his political friendships. Later he was to serve as Tulsa County treasurer, county assessor and as tag agent.

The Tulsan was serving as county treasurer when he was appointed Creek leader in October 1961 on the recommendation of then-Interior Secretary Stewart Udall.

He relinquished the county post in 1962 to

devote full time to being chief, a job which pays only \$3,600 annually.

"My father was the one who started me on trying to do something for the Creeks," McIntosh related. "You see, I'm the fourth member of the family to become a chief."

His first years as leader were frustrating, but McIntosh, a fast-moving individual who refuses to take no to most tribal demands, began winning support in high government circles.

The chief, who refers to his and his tribe's friends as "the best," feels major accomplishments of his 10 years may include:

1—Education, including construction of a \$2 million dormitory and low-cost housing complex at Eufaula.

The dorm is designed to accommodate 128 Indian children, mostly Creeks from broken homes who attend public schools in Eufaula.

2—Four successful Creek tribal claims for land acquired by the government. One, involving some 2 million acres in Seminole County, will mean about \$30 for each enrolled Creek early next year.

3—Improvement in housing and health facilities especially in rural and depressed areas of the Creek Nation.

4—More jobs for Creeks through a long-range industrial program. One such plant, a pottery facility, is being built near Checotah. "One of the things we've done to reduce sickness among our tribesmen is to improve sanitation by drilling wells and putting in septic tanks. We have made water safe for consumption," he continued.

"Another achievement came with the help of Rep. Ed Edmondson (D-Muskogee). He introduced my suggested bill wherein all lands and impounded monies of restricted Creeks who died without heirs would revert back to the Creek tribe.

"I went before both the House and Senate committees on Indian affairs to testify. Both recommended passage about three years ago over the protests of the Washington office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Passed by Congress and signed by President Johnson, the measure became law during the session in which it was introduced.

"Last year other tribal leaders had Rep. Edmondson introduce the same bill to include them. It passed and President Nixon signed it."

McIntosh, who has twice served as president of the Intertribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes (Creeks, Choctaws, Cherokees, Seminoles and Chickasaws), is critical of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington.

"Unless it is forced to do so, the BIA will never surrender its complete domination of the Indian tribes in the nation," he asserted.

"I would like to see appropriations for Indians, instead of going for overhead in Washington, be sent to the area offices and superintendents who know the Indians and live with them.

"Virgil Harrington (Muskogee area office director) is an example of a good official. He has great vision and strives to make the Indian self-sufficient."

The chief says Washington officials for "too many years" have employed Indians only in "lower echelon jobs."

The chief visited Scotland in 1964 to attend a highland gathering of the Mackintosh Clan, near Aberdeen.

While there, among 2,500 clan members from all parts of the world, the Creek leader, wearing his striking Indian headdress with 109 eagle tail feathers, stole the show. He plans to return for another assembly of his clan in 1972.

The Tulane presented the Lord Provost of Edinburgh with a gold key from the City of Tulsa. Presentation ceremonies got a big play in the Scot press.

McIntosh and his wife, Lulu, are fine pianists. They play regularly at home with one of their sons, Bill.

Two other McIntosh sons, Nocus and Chinubie, reside in Tulsa. The only daughter, Mrs. John W. Lee, lives in Riverton, Wyo.

The chief's oldest son, W. E. Jr., was killed in a California airbase crash while training for service in World War II.

The chief is especially proud of being voted an honorary member of the Rotary Club of Tulsa in August 1967.

M. M. Hargrove, head of the business administration school at the University of Tulsa, made the presentation speech, citing the chief's tribal accomplishments.

Hargrove said, in part:

"Each of us recognizes that a man can live among us and have his many outstanding achievements and talents unknown; and each of us knows, too, how much better it is to give even a rosebud of recognition to the living rather than a blanket of roses of respect to the departed."

For Dode there has been much hard work. But there have also been many roses.

THE NORTHERN IRELAND SITUATION—A REPORT NO. 6

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, during my continuing series on the Northern Ireland situation, I hope to focus attention on those problems that never reach the public eye through the mass media. My daughter Jackie and her friend, Carol Nolan, recently spent 3 days in Northern Ireland. For the next three reports, I will discuss my daughter's remarks on her visit.

In the first part of her report, she talks about the living conditions she observed while there. The startling thing about the report is the impression one gets that she is in a war-torn country. Bombings, gunfire, stop-and-search procedures, barricades and much more are a daily fact of life there. Yet the British maintain it has troops in Northern Ireland only to keep the peace.

In the next few weeks I will be reintroducing my resolution calling for a plebiscite of all the Irish people to determine the question of reunification. I hope this series will help each of my colleagues decide to join with me at that time.

The report follows:

REPORT OF JACKIE BIAGGI—PART I

The Ardoyne Relief Committee, housed in the Holy Cross School for boys, Belfast, was the basis of operation for our stay in Northern Ireland. It took only a short time to get the feel of what is really happening there for no sooner had we arrived at the school than a middle-aged woman was brought in in a state of hysteria. Someone had sent her a bullet in the mail with a warning to leave her home or suffer the consequences. When I attempted to take her picture, she became even more hysterical, fearing that the picture would be used against her. I will never forget the look of terror on her face nor the look of despair on the face of Mrs. Margaret Quinn—a former resident of Farrington Gardens, whose home of 31 years had been burnt to the ground by protestants. They burnt their own homes so that "those fenian bastards won't move in." Only Mrs. Quinn's story had a slight twist to it—for it was a British soldier who was responsible for the

destruction of her house—the butt of a gun against a gas line, a match and it was all over. Rows and rows of houses burnt to the ground. It was like a grade B movie made real. Near the site of the destruction was one of several British military posts and in our attempt to photograph the soldiers, trucks, barbed wire, etc., we must have tapped somebody's free nerve ending for as we got in the car with our photographer and were driving away three British soldiers came running down the street—rifles ready for action. Since there was no one else on the street, we assumed they had an eye on our photographer friend. But this incident was really an innocuous one, considering the fact that we were told later by soldiers in another part of the city we could take pictures "at the risk of being shot." One doesn't like taking chances, especially in a city where the tension is so great that a car backfiring was responsible for the death of a civilian by an army officer. With this as an introduction to Belfast we returned to the school, where our first meal there, we later learned, had been stolen food. Small wonder, when you took a look at the supply room. Although the school had a capacity for forty families, I still kept wondering to myself, how the seven families that were there could even manage on the meager amount of food or how they could live under the threat of snipers shooting into the school. But this was enough for the first day. Besides, it was getting dark and we wanted to get back to our hotel before the real action started. For a "quiet" weekend, there was still enough noise during the night with guns and bombs going off to give even an old Audie Murphy flick competition. Listening to the incredible noise outside, I understood full well why they nicknamed downtown Belfast "boom boom town." But we were lucky because fate deemed somehow or other that one of those bombs was to go off in the building next to ours—not in our hotel. Thank God for small favors! Considering that in the course of three days there were two soldiers shot—several bombings and raids on several of the Catholic areas, we were lucky indeed.

METHADONE: ADDICTS' CURE OR CURSE?

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, drug abuse, especially heroin addiction, is one of the most serious problems facing this country today.

Heroin addiction has reached almost epidemic proportions and its cost in human lives and property threatens to destroy our cities.

Because of the magnitude of this threat and its consequences there have been attempts to find immediate and sometimes simplistic solutions.

Unfortunately, there are no easy, one-shot answers to drug addiction. We must use every means available to deal with the problem and we must develop a wide range of possible treatments and methods of rehabilitation.

However, when a successful treatment is found it is often declared a cure-all and it becomes a panacea.

This is what has happened with the methadone maintenance programs. Methadone has worked for some people, but it has had disastrous results for

others. There is a storm of controversy now raging over its use.

Because so many irresponsible methadone programs have been set up, this form of treatment could possibly be curtailed and consequently be unavailable to the addicts who could benefit from it.

In an article in the Sunday, September 26, 1971, edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer, Patricia McBroom, one of the newspaper's science writers presents an excellent picture of the problems and controversy surrounding the use of methadone.

Perhaps if we understand why methadone is now almost part of the problem instead of the solution we can prevent similar occurrences in the future.

For this reason and with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I enter in the Record this article:

METHADONE: ADDICTS' CURE OR CURSE?

(By Patricia McBroom)

Methadone, the controversial treatment for heroin addiction, has spread like wildfire across the face of America.

Snapped up by the public, the medical community and political leaders who are under pressure to find solutions for the addiction problem, methadone has in a few short years suddenly become a primary treatment for heroin addicts.

Last year, some 4000 addicts were being maintained on methadone nationally; now there are about 10,000 and the number is due to increase rapidly in the next few years.

Rather than legalize heroin, following the British example, the United States has embraced methadone, another form of legalized narcotic addiction.

This has occurred despite the fact that the medical community responsible for controlling methadone is badly split over the pros and cons of this therapy.

Experts interviewed for this story who criticized methadone often requested that they not be quoted because of possible professional repercussions.

The medical field, in short, has a tiger by the tail and it isn't clear yet what the outcome will be.

National policy, being established in the White House by the new Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention under Dr. Jerome Jaffe, rests on the belief that hard core heroin addicts will not accept a drug-free life, so methadone will have to be the major answer for them. This policy aims at controlling addiction rather than curing it by providing addicts with a legal source of narcotics and thus reducing the addict's crimes and improving the productivity of his life.

But many experts say this decision was made too soon. They maintain it isn't clear yet whether addiction is an incurable condition, calling for widespread administration of methadone.

They also charge that methadone has been oversold and carries with it serious problems:

The drug is as addictive as heroin.

Methadone has a tendency to leak into the black market, becoming yet another opiate of abuse.

Methadone programs in Philadelphia and elsewhere have been far less successful than the original New York experiments that generated the national move to methadone.

Methadone by itself does nothing but support the addict's habit and even methadone advocates say the programs should have counseling, vocational and other services along with the drug—a policy which is difficult to follow in practice with the pressure to get large numbers of addicts on methadone as soon as possible.

Of major cities, Philadelphia was one of

the least prepared to leap into methadone so soon.

Dr. Jacob Schut, who last month took over direction of Philadelphia's largest methadone program—run by the West Philadelphia Mental Health Consortium for about 1000 addicts—frankly admitted the program is a "monster."

It grew so fast it outstripped the capacity of medical and therapeutic personnel to keep up with the numbers and provide the vocational and counseling services that are supposed to come with a methadone program.

"The program started cautiously with 10 selected patients in 1967," said Dr. Schut. "Then it grew to 30, 100, 300 patients. Community pressure, patient pressure and political pressure made this grow to 950," said Dr. Schut.

"The pressure continues. I cannot close the doors."

Dr. Schut is now evaluating the program's therapeutic needs to request more money for badly needed non-drug services.

Nevertheless he said he doesn't regret what happened and even unsuccessfully petitioned a federal agency recently to double the program.

Dr. Schut and others working with methadone have in their favor an argument that is hard to beat: No matter what the disadvantages of methadone, it is far sight better than the original heroin addiction.

Methadone differs from heroin in its length of action and that one factor accounts primarily for its medical usefulness.

Instead of heroin's five to six hours, methadone effects last 24 hours, so that the addict is not going through cycles of sleepy euphoria and withdrawal sickness several times a day. At first the addict may feel high on methadone, but gradually he becomes accustomed to the dose and euphoria disappears.

With a legal source of drugs, the addict can get out of the heroin hustle and hold down a job, which many methadone patients—but not all of them—are doing.

Stabilized on daily doses of methadone, the addict can function in near normal capacity. He usually won't get a kick out of heroin because his nerve cells are already satiated with methadone.

"This so-called blocking" effect of methadone is in principle like preventing a man from getting a kick from scotch by keeping him drunk on gin.

However, the opiate drugs are not incapacitating like alcohol is nor do they cause the physical damage that alcohol does over the long run.

How many addicts on methadone are actually taking advantage of their opportunity to escape from the criminal hustle and become productive is a question that inspires heated debate.

Methadone advocates consistently claim that the majority of addicts have lower arrest and higher employment rates once they are in programs.

Critics just as consistently attack these statistics, claiming that the arrest-employment figures are based on the addict's own report—a somewhat biased source of information.

"It's like saying, 'You give me methadone, I'll tell you what you want to know,'" said one critic.

Dr. Frederick Glaser, part of a three-man team at Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute selected to do a state-wide evaluation of drug abuse programs, also questions the data. "I'm not satisfied that studies demonstrate conclusively that methadone diminishes the amount of crime committed by addicts or enhances their employment."

To such criticism, California's Dr. John Kramer, who will soon become assistant director to Dr. Jaffe at the White House, answered rather heatedly:

"Without presenting super-objective data,

there is no question in my mind as to the fact that individual addicts (on methadone) are far better off than they were, they get arrested less frequently, they don't feel high, they are physiologically normalized, they go to work and they steal less often."

In Philadelphia, Irving Soloway, research director of the consortium program, said arrest figures are not considered very reliable here, but employment data shows that 60 percent of the addicts don't have jobs when they enter the methadone program, whereas only 40 percent are unemployed after six months on methadone.

With 1000 addicts, that represents a gain of 200 jobs—a substantial improvement but less impressive than the 80 percent success rate claimed by the original methadone researchers—Drs. Vincent Dole and Marie Nyswander in New York.

Urine analysis of addicts in the consortium program would suggest that roughly half of the addicts are still using heroin regularly, which will provide a high if the addict waits 24 hours until the effects of methadone wear off and then shoots up. Another ploy is to use heroin on weekends and sell the weekend dose of methadone, which addicts are allowed to take home. Weekdays they must swallow the methadone in the clinic.

If these urine analysis figures are to be trusted (they also are challenged), it means 500 addicts are still in the heroin hustle even while on methadone.

Looked at another way, it means 500 are out of the hustle and that's better than none.

The truth seems to be that methadone is helping many people, but it's no panacea and its further expansion carries undeniable risks.

Methadone is a dangerous drug and the dose that maintains an addict could kill an intolerant individual.

It almost killed two small children in Philadelphia who mistakenly drank the Tang orange juice which contains the addict's methadone dose, and did kill a 5-year-old in New York.

In addition, street deaths from methadone are now appearing as the drug circulates widely on the black market.

New York had nine reported methadone deaths in 1970. This month a University of Pennsylvania doctor reported two cases of methadone overdose, of which one died.

Programs also carry the risk of addicting people who are not actually hooked on heroin, even though they think they are.

Illicit heroin may be cut so much that some addicts, particularly young ones, don't get enough opiate to become addicted.

The only study on the question, done in 1950, indicated that 50 percent of those who used heroin were not physically addicted.

But Dr. Roger E. Meyer of Boston University and a consultant to the Special Action Office, questioned the relevance of that figure today. He said it is impossible to determine how many addicts are not truly addicted.

Dr. Meyer also said he does not think the problem of putting pseudo-addicts on methadone is a serious one for most programs, because these are screened out of the program.

Other experts said, however, that such screening is not being done. Addiction is typically established through medical histories (the addict's recount) and urine analysis, which reveals only that heroin was taken.

True addiction can only be established by having the addict show withdrawal symptoms.

No methadone source contacted in this story was following such a procedure.

The Federal Food and Drug Administration recently suggested that addicts be tried on other treatments first before being placed on methadone to screen out the people who are not really hooked.

In any case, the FDA suggestion fell on

rocky soil. Pennsylvania for instance, has neither the programs nor the hospital beds yet to handle 500 addicts, much less than 1500 or more patients already on methadone.

"We don't have enough beds for detoxification to do drug-free programs," said Dr. Catherine Hess, state narcotics adviser in the Health Department. "At last count there were 100 beds in the whole state for detoxification," (including all drug and alcohol abuse), she said.

Nor do federal plans at the White House envision trying all addicts on other programs first. According to Dr. Meyer, plans are aimed at giving addicts a choice of a variety of treatments, both drug free and methadone maintenance, but with the expectation that most hard core addicts will choose methadone.

According to Dr. Hess and Dr. William Wieland, who is coordinating Philadelphia's program at the Office of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, both state and local plans here are following the same course.

There is, however, no doubt about a patient's addiction to methadone. The typical maintenance dose—100 milligrams a day—is a large dose of opiates, deliberately high enough to prevent the addict from getting enough heroin to overcome its effects.

"It's hell," said Morgan Shuler, an ex-addict with Philadelphia's Diagnostic and Rehabilitation Center. Shuler, an addict for 20 years, said he was once addicted to methadone and it took him 27 days to kick the habit (as compared to six or seven days for heroin). It was like having the flu for 27 days. It gets into your bones. My knees, my elbows, everything just ached. It hurt to do anything."

Like everyone else in the drug abuse field, Shuler has strong feelings about methadone maintenance. His are anti. "I'm prejudiced," he said, "I don't like it."

Shuler said many heroin addicts fear kicking the methadone habit so they won't buy black market methadone unless "things are tight with heroin."

Despite state efforts to clamp down on the methadone flow into illicit channels by making it illegal for private physicians to prescribe the drug, Shuler claimed methadone is still as easy to buy in Philadelphia as a pack of cigarettes. He said a vial of methadone costs from \$5 to \$15.

Shuler also said many addicts, particularly young ones, don't realize methadone is a narcotic, even though they may be told by clinic doctors.

"The only thing the young guy is thinking about is not having to go through withdrawal, so he thinks 'I'll get methadone.' He doesn't realize he's going to have to go through it with methadone. You can tell him the truth, he still thinks he's smarter than you; he thinks there's some way around it."

At the consortium program, addicts sign a consent form explaining that methadone is an addicting drug.

So far, however, few addicts are coming off methadone maintenance, so withdrawal hasn't become a major problem—yet.

Withdrawal will be done in the consortium program if the addict requests it, but few do.

At Mantua Halfway House, a private methadone program in Philadelphia with about 200 patients, eventual withdrawal from drugs is a major thrust of the program, said its medical director, Dr. Kermit Gosnell.

Dr. Gosnell said he doesn't expect more than a quarter of his addicts to need methadone for more than a year. "There is such a strong feeling toward detoxification that addicts may convince themselves they're ready before they are," said Dr. Gosnell, who makes addicts come seven days a week for their methadone to keep them uncomfortable with their addiction.

But this philosophy is an exception among methadone programs. Most accept the idea of indefinite maintenance. Moreover, if

withdrawal from drugs is the eventual aim, methadone may not be the best way to approach it. A followup study of 21 addicts detoxified in the consortium program revealed the disheartening fact that 90 percent went back to opiates within six months.

A variety of drug free programs operated by the Federal Government and New York state are achieving greater success than that.

These are civil commitment programs and so attract the addicts willing to commit themselves to several years of outpatient rehabilitation plus six months at installations like the big federal facility in Lexington.

Of some 1,300 addicts treated through the Federal Government, a soon-to-be-published study shows that 13 percent are free of drugs altogether and of the remainder 80 percent are drug free 80 percent of the time.

"This is working," said Dr. Carl Chambers, director of research for the New York State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission. "What we must find out is who it's working with and how we can do it better."

Also waiting in the wings are the narcotic antagonists—drugs that truly block the effects of opiates, but which have no opiate or addictive qualities themselves. One such drug, naloxone, is viewed as the most promising of these, but several years of tests are still needed before the drug is ready for general use.

Again, the antagonists are seen as appealing only to a minority of addicts—perhaps 20 to 30 percent of them—who are young, not fully addicted or willing to give up opiates.

At both the local and national level, authorities are gearing up a variety of drug programs, using antagonists, therapeutic communities, day hospitals, halfway houses and other approaches to meet the epidemic of drug abuse.

Despite these alternatives (all more expensive than methadone) the system is being heavily weighted toward methadone maintenance for the majority of urban hard core addicts, because it has been decided they will not stick with any other choice.

Whether this is true or not, it may well be a self-fulfilling prophecy, as thousands of addicts discover they are expected to be opiate dependent for life.

The question of what legalized narcotic addiction will do for or to the country is now impossible to predict.

If it does not make a substantial impact on crime, the political rationale for pressing so quickly to methadone may collapse or even backfire.

At best, methadone will serve as a temporary harbor to handle the addicted masses until the nation can develop a range of approaches hopefully aimed at getting the majority off drugs altogether, using methadone only as a last resort for addicts who can't profit from other treatment.

At worst, it could become a medical scandal, an expedient way of handling drug addiction by supporting addicts on a legal habit in ever-expanding numbers, with all the attendant risks of a growing black market in methadone.

Heroin was once used to treat morphine addicts before it became a drug of abuse. The question in many minds is: Will methadone be the same?

LOUIS A. TOEPFER

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, all those interested in the furtherance of education will be pleased to

learn, as I was, that Louis A. Toepfer, a distinguished scholar and an authority on the law, has agreed to accept the position of president of Case Western Reserve University—one of the Nation's renowned institutions of higher learning—at Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Toepfer was elected to the post by the university's board of trustees, although he had requested that he not be considered a candidate. The Presidential Search Committee of the Board of Trustees proceeded to screen the qualifications of some 200 other persons, finally concluding that no one else measured up to Mr. Toepfer's qualifications. They approached him with the offer and, fortunately for the students and faculty and everyone else concerned, he relented.

It was Mr. Toepfer's own performance that had made it so evident he was the best choice. Since last fall, he had been acting president of the university. In 1966, he was named dean of the university's law school.

During his tenure as acting president, Mr. Toepfer has faced a full range of academic, financial and planning challenges.

He has been concerned with issues and concepts which will affect the university for years to come—among them the reorganization of several of the university's faculties and the examination and modification of the undergraduate collegiate structure.

He has developed, with the cooperation and assistance of the deans and provosts, the plan to turn around the university's 4-year history of increasing costs and mounting deficits. This plan calls for a sharply reduced deficit for 1971-72 and a commitment to a balanced budget for 1972-73.

Prior to joining the university, Toepfer had been associated with the Harvard Law School for 19 years, including 16 years as vice dean. His professional interests include maritime law, legal services for the poor, and criminal law.

A native of Sheboygan, Wis., Toepfer received the A.B. degree, magna cum laude, from Beloit College in 1940, and the LL.B. degree from Harvard Law School in 1947. He is a member of the American, Ohio and Cleveland Bar Associations, a trustee of the Cleveland Legal Aid Society, and chairman of the Managing Committee of the American Bar Association's Fund for Legal Education.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

BLACK NONSENSE

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, recently I came across an editorial in the Crisis, a publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, entitled "Black Nonsense." I wish to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives since I feel it is worth reading:

BLACK NONSENSE

The new cult of blackness has spawned many astounding vagaries, most of them harmless, some of them intriguing and others merely amusing. One which has recently gained a measure of academic and foundation recognition is not only sheer nonsense but also a cruel hoax which, if allowed to go unchallenged, can cripple generations of black youngsters in their preparation to compete in the open market with their non-Negro peers.

The New York Times and the Daily News report that New York City's Brooklyn College has enrolled some 50 Negro students in a course in "black" English taught as their native language by Miss Carol Reed, described by the NEWS as "a young linguist who heads the language curriculum research project at Brooklyn College." The project is financed by a \$65,000 Ford Foundation grant.

It appears that Miss Reed (and she is not alone in this fantasy) is trying to transform a vernacular which is more regional than racial, i.e., more southern than Negro, into a full-fledged distinct language which the college offers as a course. This language is merely the English of the undereducated with provincial variances in accent and structure from locale to locale throughout the English-speaking world. One might as well call the cockney of the London East Enders or the speech patterns of the Appalachian whites separate languages. The so-called black English is basically the same slovenly English spoken by the South's under-educated poor white population.

What our children need, and other disadvantaged American children as well—Indian, Spanish-speaking, Asian, Appalachian and Immigrant Caucasians—is training in basic English which today is as near an international language as any in the world. To attempt to lock them into a provincial patois is to limit their opportunities in the world at large. Black children can master Oxonian English as well as any WASP child of the English Midlands. But each has to be taught the language. No one is born speaking "black" cockney, pidgin, standard or "white" English. Children learn to speak what they hear and are taught. Let our children have the opportunity, and be encouraged, to learn the language which will best enable them to comprehend modern science and technology, equip them to communicate intelligently with other English-speaking peoples of all races, and to share in the exercise of national power.

Black parents throughout this nation should rise up in unanimous condemnation of this insidious conspiracy to cripple their children permanently. It is time to repudiate this black nonsense and to take appropriate action against institutions which foster it in craven capitulation to the fantasies of the extreme black cultists and their pale and spineless sycophants.

Let the black voice of protest resound thunderously throughout the land.

We should heed the eloquent plea of this editorial, for too many in trying to help lose sight of reality and in the end result retard rather than enlighten our children. This is too precious and sacred a trust to be experimenting with.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL TASK
FORCE ON PCB'S

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1970, I requested that the Council on Environmental Quality undertake immediately to coordinate the efforts of all appropriate Federal agencies in regard to safeguarding the public from the hazards of a persistent, highly toxic, industrial chemical—polychlorinated biphenyls—PCB's. Therefore, I was most interested to learn that such an interdepartmental task force relating to this problem finally has been established and will be coordinated through the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Science and Technology.

Although I believe it to be extremely unfortunate that it took recent occurrences of massive food contamination to stimulate the Government to take this much needed and long overdue endeavor, I am hopeful that the creation of this task force signals a new awareness on the part of the Federal Government as to the threat to health posed by this dangerous chemical. Hopefully, this task force will now take every possible action to insure that our environment and our health are effectively protected from the dangers of PCB contamination.

At this point I include in the RECORD an article by Richard Lyons that appeared in the New York Times on September 23 relating to this situation.

The article follows:

A DDT-LIKE LIQUID STUDIED FOR HAZARDS

(By Richard D. Lyons)

WASHINGTON.—Officials of seven Federal agencies are expressing increasing concern over the possible health hazards of a colorless, odorless liquid named PCB that some scientists hold to be even more dangerous than DDT, to which it has a close chemical resemblance.

Large amounts of PCB, perhaps tens of thousands of tons, are used annually as insulating fluids and as a means of transferring heat from one mechanism to another, such as in electrical transformers, because it has an extraordinary ability to stand up under heat. PCB, which has the consistency of molasses, can withstand temperatures of up to 1,600 degrees Fahrenheit. It is also used in noncarbon copying paper, paints and pesticides.

In the last few months large amounts of PCB, or polychlorinated biphenyl, have been found in chickens, eggs, turkeys, salmon and fish meal.

This led the President's Office of Science and Technology and his Council on Environmental Quality to form a study group two weeks ago to investigate the presence of PCB in food and other compounds.

Since mid-August at least three scientific meetings have extensively discussed PCB, including a session of Nobel laureates in Gote-

borg, Sweden. The scientists concluded that PCB "concentrations may reach levels sufficient to damage ecosystems irreversibly on a worldwide scale before the damage is recognized."

"Their entry into the marine environment should be curtailed to every practical extent, even if this requires constructions on their production and use," the Goteborg statement added.

William D. Ruckelshaus, head of the Environmental Protection Agency, noted in an interview today that "it is the sudden accumulation of information about PCB that gives us concern because it is used so widely in the environment."

The agency is part of the PCB study group, which also includes representatives of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, and the Food and Drug Administration.

Dr. Charles C. Edwards, F.D.A. Commissioner, also said in an interview today that the study group had been convened at his agency's request "because we realized that PCB was a hell of a lot bigger problem than that of the F.D.A. alone."

James D. Grant, the deputy F.D.A. Commissioner, said, "We want PCB out of the food supply, but we don't yet regard it as an imminent hazard to health."

The chemical has been in use for 40 years. Like DDT, it resists decomposition and hence persists in the environment for years. DDT and PCB are so alike chemically that until several years ago it was almost impossible to detect one from the other by microchemical analysis.

Because of this heretofore undetectable difference, much of the environmental contamination by DDT is believed to have been caused by a combination of DDT and PCB.

To date, there has been only one episode linking PCB with health hazards to humans. Three years ago in Japan five persons died and about 1,000 were afflicted with a severe skin disease named chloroacne because a rice cooking oil had been contaminated by PCB.

There have also been indications that some pregnant women who became ill later then had babies with birth defects.

Dr. Robert Risebrough, an authority on PCB who is a professor at the University of California at Berkeley, told a Senate Commerce subcommittee last month that two babies were stillborn and "all showed symptoms" of PCB poisoning.

Yet Dr. Risebrough and other authorities have raised the possibility that PCB in itself may not be harmful to humans, but that the culprit may be a chemical byproduct named chlorinated dibenzofuran. This chemical is believed to be capable of causing birth defects to fowl, fish and perhaps rats.

Mr. Grant said that chlorinated dibenzofuran, a chemical akin to the herbicide 2, 4, 5-T, has been found in samples of PCB manufactured outside the United States, but not within. The chemical may be either a decomposition product of PCB, or a contaminant associated with the making of the parent product.

IMPURITY FOUND RECENTLY

The effects of chlorinated dibenzofuran and its link with PCB are not clearly understood. It was only last year that a Dutch scientist, Dr. J. G. Vos, found the impurity.

The Monsanto Company of St. Louis, which is the only American manufacturer of PCB, has been conducting a two-year study of the effects of the chemical on rats and dogs. A company spokesman said that no ill effects had yet been detected.

He added that the company was taking steps to insure that products containing PCB were not sold to food manufacturing and processing companies. Yet he refused to divulge the amount of the chemical being made.

Other sources have estimated, however, that the annual production is on the order of tens of thousands of tons. PCB is also made in Europe, Asia and the Soviet Union.

A report of the DDT advisory committee that was given to Mr. Ruckelshaus two weeks ago noted:

"It appears that the most serious chronic PCB contamination is in fish and fish-eating birds. Apparently PCBs are widely distributed among marine birds which are the terminal carnivores of a complex mesh of food chains in the sea . . . Most of the acute residues of PCBs found to date can be attributed usually to inadvertent or accidental industrial causes."

In recent months as many as 88,000 chickens, 50,000 turkeys and tens of thousands of eggs have been destroyed because of PCB contamination of feed for fowl.

Over the last two years Representative William F. Ryan, Democrat of Manhattan, has been seeking to have the chemical banned. He complained that until recently no Federal agency would heed his call for an investigation of the substance.

"I think this is a real disregard for the public health and welfare," he said today.

MISSISSIPPI'S LOW CRIME RATE

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the House's attention to the low crime rate in Mississippi. This annual pleasure is occasioned by the publication of the FBI's Uniform Crime Report for 1971 which shows Mississippi to have a crime rate lower than 48 States and the District of Columbia.

The crime rate in Mississippi is only 863.4 incidents per hundred thousand population and is exceeded only by North Dakota, with a rate of 846.1. Mississippi's low rate is less than one-third of the rate of 2,740.3 for the Nation as a whole.

Of course one criminal is one too many but the significance of Mississippi's low rate, at 863.4, is glaringly obvious when compared with those mythical havens of learning and light such as New York City with a crime rate of 5,200.0, or San Francisco, Calif., at 5,329.3, or with the Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C., having a crime rate of 4,110.7 per hundred thousand residents.

The credit for this accomplishment can go directly to Mississippi's hard-working and dedicated force of city police, sheriffs, constables, highway patrol, and her citizens. It is to their everlasting credit that they are able to provide an environment in which every criminal act is not regarded as a "product of society" and every criminal is not treated to the luxury of being merely "sick" and in need of treatment.

The result, Mr. Speaker, is a stable society with respect for law and order in which law enforcement officials are given the necessary community support and cooperation to bring criminals swiftly to justice.

In the face of discriminatory attacks upon the good name of the State of

Mississippi, I recommend our critics improve their own home States before so quickly condemning another.

YOUNG AIDES WILL HELP TEENS END BAD "TRIPS"

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in view of the many criticisms of modern American youth, so often unjustified, it was with considerable pleasure that I read a refreshing and uplifting report in the Boston Herald-Traveler, September 27, concerning an innovative and constructive approach on the part of the youth in my 10th Congressional District toward meeting the epidemic of drug addiction. Dr. Steven Baron, assistant administrator at the Newton-Wellesley Hospital, of which I have the honor to be a trustee, in cooperation with the Newton-Wellesley-Weston Multi-Service Center, the Weston and Wellesley Youth Centers, and the Weston-Wellesley Hotline, and junior and senior members of Wellesley and Weston High Schools have joined hands in offering new hope to youth desperate to overcome drug addiction, but overwhelmed by its paralyzing effects. These high school volunteers are serving as aides in the emergency room at the Newton-Wellesley Hospital weekends to encourage and strengthen the resolve of their peers confronted with this tragic plight.

With the hope that other communities will benefit from this truly meritorious and commendable program, I am pleased to insert the article which appeared in the Boston Herald-Traveler:

NEW SERVICE AT NEWTON-WELLESLEY HOSPITAL: YOUNG AIDES WILL HELP TEENS END BAD "TRIPS"

(By Barbara Rabinovitz)

The youthful drug user, strung out or overdosed and in need of medical attention, will soon find his peers offering him assistance in the emergency room of the Newton-Wellesley Hospital.

Some 20 juniors and seniors from Wellesley and Weston High Schools will begin a three-week training session next Monday in preparation for assuming duties as counselors to young people suffering the effects of drug abuse.

With the high school volunteers acting as a buffer between hospital personnel and drug abuse patients, organizers of the program hope to eliminate the fear of reprisals or misunderstandings they say has deterred many potential drug abuse patients from seeking medical care at a hospital.

"Many of them see the hospital as part of the sterile establishment—pale colors, bright lights, nurses in uniform. Or they're afraid we'll call the police, or that they'll be shoved into a room, the door closed, and that will be the end of it," explained Steven D. Baron, assistant administrator for professional services at Newton-Wellesley Hospital, during an interview.

"You could tell a kid who'd call about a friend who was overdosed to get over to the

hospital. And they'd usually ask, 'What else can we do?'"

Baron and representatives of four other agencies, the Newton-Wellesley-Weston Multi-Service Center, the Weston and Wellesley Youth Centers, and the Weston-Wellesley hotline, have joined forces in establishing the program. Their goal: "We just want young people on drugs to know that they can walk in here and get treatment like anyone else with an injury or illness," Baron said.

The young volunteers, with their parents' permission, will be on duty on Fridays and Saturdays from 7 p.m. to 2 a.m. They will obtain from the patients certain medical data, such as what drug was taken and in what dosage, and will relay that information to the doctors and nurses.

But the primary role of these non-professionals in the emergency room will be to provide a listening ear for the youth who needs to be talked down from a bad trip.

Sometimes that can take a few hours, sometimes days. "The nurses and doctors don't have that kind of time," Baron said. "If they have a cardiac arrest case come in, they have to take care of that."

On the theory that "the chances of a nurse or a doctor sitting in a white uniform talking down a kid are nil," according to Baron, the volunteers will be dressed in their everyday garb.

The training will enable the high schoolers to offer their services to other agencies involved. They will know how to man hotline telephones and organize youth center activities, as well as counsel patients in the hospital.

"We want this program to provide continuity of care. Up to now, kids were treated and sent back out onto the street. Now they'll be encouraged to maintain contact with the counselors and use other agencies," said Baron.

As to the effectiveness of the program the administrator speculated: "The young people are the only ones that seem to be able to help. Peers help peers. They help them to get on drugs. They help them to get off."

MR. UDALL AND POSTAL SERVICE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Udall's partisan attack on the Postal Service for its choice of managing underwriters, and their choice of counsel, has no basis in fact and is completely uncalled for. The unfounded inuendoes with which his statement is so liberally laced are purely political. His inferences are wrong and improper.

I have reviewed with the Postal Service their procedures in making their selections and the reasons for their choices. I am completely convinced that that choice is justified on the basis of sound business judgment and was not influenced by political considerations. All five firms are leaders in their industry and the combination of their particular talents will afford the Postal Service as strong a sponsorship as could be achieved.

Mr. Udall has not alleged any act of misconduct, as indeed he could not in view of the record. He raises questions of the appearance of impropriety based on incorrect facts, apparently with little ef-

fort to verify these facts. The Postal Service has promptly and completely replied to all of Mr. Udall's requests for information. There is not a shred of evidence to support any claim of wrongdoing.

Men of good will in both parties fought long and hard to take the Post Office out of politics. It is deplorable that Mr. Udall, who in the past supported this cause, has now seen fit to revert to playing politics with postal affairs.

This partisan action has all the earmarks of a purely political attack as a prelude to next year's election. It is certainly not just a coincidence that this report was issued on the same weekend that Mr. Udall entered the vice-presidential sweepstakes by endorsing Mr. Muskie for President.

IN-DEPTH STUDY OF HIGHWAYS IN UNITED STATES IS INITIATED

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, many of us in the Congress have been troubled by the priorities that have been established in America's transportation policy. I have introduced a number of proposals to study the problem of transportation in America and to encourage greater emphasis on mass transit systems.

Today, I would like to report that a new initiative in this area is being undertaken by the Council on Economic Priorities. CEP is a private, nonprofit organization which publishes information on corporate conduct in many fields. Currently, CEP is conducting an in-depth study of highways and the highway trust fund, focusing on both the corporate and political forces which shape national highway and transportation policy. I am pleased to add that several student interns from George Washington University, working in my office this fall, will be aiding in researching the project.

The following is an item which appeared in the June-July 1971 issue of the Economic Priorities Report, describing the project:

COUNCIL NEWS—New CEP Study

CEP has initiated an in-depth study of highways in the U.S. It will explore two basic questions:

(1) Who are the major corporate beneficiaries of the federal highway program? In addition to corporations deriving benefit from highway building—such as construction, asphalt and cement firms—the study will focus on those gaining from highway use, such as petroleum, automobile and trucking firms.

(2) What are the relationships between these business interests and the federal government? This portion will focus upon the techniques used by corporate interests to foster additional highway building; the organizations which represent these industries and companies, and the history and operation of the Highway Trust Fund.

The CEP study will also look into broader questions such as what a highway is and does, what the economic and social impact of highway construction and use is on the U.S., and whether highways breed more highways and more auto traffic.

Director of the study is Goody L. Solomon, consumer writer and former editorial consultant to the President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN G. DOW TOURS FORT DIX EXTENSION FACILITIES

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, September 24, I spent the day at Fort Dix, a good part of it in the detention stockade. Numbers of cases of soldiers in trouble there, and indeed the report of one death, have come across my desk. I visited Fort Dix in order to see what problems young men from my district encounter in the Army.

The disciplinary part of Fort Dix consists of a personnel control facility, where the men are not confined, and a stockade, where they are. These units seem to be orderly and trim, both in their physical appearance and in the conduct of the men being held, as well as the Army staff in charge. The officers are well aware of the individual human problems as well as the painful significance of the detention system within the Army and our American society.

Both the men held in detention and the Army staff are part of a system that permits trouble to generate, but has no real solution to offer.

The men in detention at Fort Dix are not criminals. Almost to a man, the charge against them is absence without leave—AWOL. I spoke to the men in the presence of officers and also separately by myself.

Out of 20 men, I found that 19 had been AWOL because of family problems. Two-thirds of the family problems involved money. In some cases the records of the men were lost or held at faraway bases where they had served. This meant they received no pay.

While the officers at Fort Dix said there were generally ways of advancing money to needy men, it seems that the men are frequently mistrustful of officers and do not ask for help when it might be forthcoming. So the men in the personnel control facility often go AWOL again to reach their families. Consequently they wind up in the stockade with more black marks against their records.

The new military pay raise, set to go into effect on October 1, would ease some of these greivous financial burdens. However, no one seems to know whether the raise will be held back owing to the wage-price freeze.

Lacking money, men in the facility have been selling their blankets in the nearby community. As a consequence, the facility recalls all blankets in the morning and reissues them at night.

Thus complaints that came to me in Washington indicated that men had difficulty in getting blankets. I cite this blanket problem, not because it is the worst, but because it is a good example of how one set of troubles at Fort Dix pyramids into another.

In my judgment, drugs are a real problem at Fort Dix, but not the overriding problem. The overriding problem is the inability of some men to take Army life when they are beset with difficulties existing in their families.

A certain few just cannot take Army life, in any case. I found some, in solitary cells, who asked to be there because it protected them from the pressures outside which they could not stand. One man in solitary was trembling out of a death fear. Another had attempted suicide earlier in the day.

The rules of the Army require either court martial—and punishment—for men who have gone AWOL for extended periods; or else offenders receive discharges in the less than honorable categories. Here trouble may arise when a man to be discharged does not yet have his papers from Vietnam or wherever he was when he went AWOL. Thus he waits in limbo for the paper-hunting process to straighten itself out. Perhaps he will get into more trouble while waiting. The vaunted computer capacities of the services are of little help.

Some of the men claim that offenses far more serious than AWOL are punished less severely. Perhaps AWOL is serious because it offends the Army, the institution itself, whereas manslaughter offends against someone else.

At any rate, the offending soldier and even the staff officers who want to do the correct thing, are caught in the rigid meshes of a vast and impersonal institution.

So this is why men are held at Fort Dix and why so much distress results from it.

I would like to offer some brief conclusions which I am passing on to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird and Army Secretary Stanley Resor.

The family troubles that beset the young men come to light first when they are in their original service units. It is my impression that many of these men are embittered because their company officers refused to listen to them or to help them. From these experiences it is clear that not a few of the men distrust the officer class. I would say that all company officers should be directed to listen and help when a man says he has family problems.

Men who have lasting family difficulties should not be held in the Army. The cost and attention necessarily focused on these so-called troublemakers is not worth the benefit of keeping them.

Certainly they are held and punished as a measure of fairness to the men who stay in service, who grin and bear it. Yet the military services cannot fulfill their missions unless the men serving are satisfied and reasonable happy to stay in any case. I hope the forthcoming pay increase will ameliorate this situation.

Also, the Army must whip its computer system into line so that instanta-

neous printout of any man's up-to-date record is available at every teletype station. When men are in grave difficulty relating to their families, their future as written on the discharge papers, and their honor, it is inexcusable that their trials should be compounded by missing papers.

Like American prisons generally, the detention facilities at Fort Dix, where there are essentially no real criminals, is another example of men trapped in a system that is far too big and is ill-designed to reckon with human sensibility.

The failure of the military concept in Vietnam, the suspicion that it does as much harm to men as it does benefit, the fact that now after years of the draft and years of the war, the condition of the Army is a worry to its most devoted members, calls for a profound rethinking and readjustment of the military's place in American society.

Instead of considering it purely for the military mission, we must weigh it as part of our social and economic fabric when these are torn by the military presence. In this light, its mode of operations and its master policies must be redefined.

"ZONED FOR DISEASE"—CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING IN MILWAUKEE AND CHICAGO

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a particularly significant 1-hour television program was broadcast by public television station WMVS in Milwaukee, Wis. The program, an investigative report on the childhood lead poisoning problem in Milwaukee, Wis., was produced by John Owen, who was also the reporter who conducted the interviews recorded in the program.

Focusing on childhood lead poisoning as an urban environmental problem, the program, entitled "Zoned for Disease," profiles several cases of lead poisoned children in Milwaukee, showing the condition of the homes in which they live and examining the treatment available at local hospitals. The program studies the lead poisoning screening program and data clinic in Chicago, Ill., where Dr. Herbert Slutsky, coordinator of the project, explains its effectiveness. Alternatives available to Milwaukee are set forth. Dr. Frederick Blodgett, of Milwaukee Children's Hospital, discusses what the city is doing with present resources, and Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel, Milwaukee Commissioner of Health, explains the city's proposed lead poisoning program. The program concludes with a 10-minute reaction session. Guests are Milwaukee Alderman Mrs. Vel Phillips and Joseph Mangiamale, professor of urban affairs at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

This program, as all discussions of childhood lead poisoning, depicts the tragic devastation being visited upon children living in dilapidated housing,

where the lead-tainted paint and plaster chips which fall from the walls and ceilings are picked up and eaten by innocent, unknowing youngsters.

I commend the transcript of "Zoned for Disease," which I am including in the RECORD, to my colleagues. The specific cities involved are Milwaukee and Chicago. But they could be any cities—large or small—throughout this country.

In addition to the production and reporting performed by John Owen, other participants in the preparation of "Zoned for Disease" were Ron Salak, director, and Phillip Powers, cinematographer.

The transcript of "Zoned for Disease" follows:

"ZONED FOR DISEASE"—CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING IN MILWAUKEE AND CHICAGO

INTRODUCTION: FILM MONTAGE

A series of Sound-on-Film clips are seen at the beginning of the program. Audio is as follows:

Mrs. STAPLES (Mother of Lead Poisoned Child): Well, when I saw him, he was peeling them off with his nails, but the day that I noticed him doing this and got him away from out there, out here, he was very active that morning and that evening he took a temperature all of a sudden so that made me thought lead. We always after him about putting even his dirty hands in his mouth, or open a bottle or just tasting or anything that he wants to see what it is, you know.

Dr. LAWRENCE KAMMHOZ (Director of the Lead Poisoning Clinic, Milwaukee Children's Hospital and Clinical Instructor in Pediatrics at the Medical College of Wisconsin): Because if a child goes back to the same environment, he is going to pick up more lead and come back worse than he was before. So we have to insure that the child is out of the problem area.

Mrs. NUNLEY (Mother of Lead Poisoned Child): Every place that I go to is worse than the one I'm in. Not only that, there was big holes in the walls and the paint was peeling off.

Dr. HERBERT SLUTSKY (Coordinator of Lead Poisoning Program in Chicago): Visit a State Institution for the insane and take a look at children in essence who can only be best described as calling them vegetables, total brain damage, significant maximum brain damage caused by ingestion of plaster painted with lead paint.

TEXT

REPORTER. Before this summer is over, 400,000 small children will get lead poisoning in neighborhoods like this one. If not reached quickly enough, many will die from it; 200 did last year. Though it is what many experts consider to be a totally preventable disease, lead poisoning right now claims more children than did polio before the Salk Vaccine was developed. And the poor can't get away from the lead paint threat. Most of the newer lead-free suburbs are zoned to keep large low income families out. So the poor end up with their own perverse zoning arrangement: exclusive rights to lead poisoning. Their neighborhoods might as well be zoned for disease.

David is now nine. He celebrated his seventh birthday two years ago by being admitted to the Southern Wisconsin Colony and Training School in Union Grove. David is mentally retarded, and lead poisoning is one of the reasons that he's here. Nationally, six to eight thousand children each year become mentally retarded as a result of lead poisoning, and the experience of Chicago tells us that there is probably an alarming number of children in Milwaukee who have suffered brain damage. A follow-up study in Chicago revealed that of 425 children treated for lead paint poisoning, 38% were diagnosed

to be mentally retarded. It will cost taxpayers an estimated \$225,000 to support David in this institution for the remainder of his life; it might have cost as little as \$1,000 to treat David for lead poisoning and to remove the lead from his home.

Another frightening possibility must be faced too. What if the children we label slow learners are failing because of the damage done to them by lead? These children assigned to this special education class at Palmer Jr. High School have never been checked for lead poisoning, and yet it cannot be dismissed as a possible cause of their learning problems. Multiply their numbers nationally and you arrive at a potentially staggering figure of lead poisoning casualties who in turn become educational casualties.

Over 100 lead poisoning cases have been recorded in Milwaukee in the last three years and an additional twenty so far this summer. But that figure is meaningless unless you understand that it shows only those children treated at hospitals. At that point they become statistics. But since no screening program exists here, we really don't know how many children are lead poisoned. Based on results of screening programs elsewhere, we can estimate that between five and ten percent of the children at risk—those between one and six living in high lead areas—are lead poisoned.

The symptoms are hard to detect. Parents don't know if their child is sick or just listless. Two year old Ladell Drew has been hospitalized twice for lead poisoning, but his mother would not have known had Ladell not swallowed one of her tranquilizers.

Mrs. DREW (Mother of Lead Poisoned Child). His attitude with the children was he played with them but he tried to play, you know, real rough, and like I say stumble a lot and sometime he just sit up and get real quiet, you know, and he'd look down at people, you know, he wouldn't look at them right, just look down, and his eyes would go up, and besides that his eatin' habits were alright, you know, he, like I told the doctor, he ate pretty good, you know. There wasn't any real big effects, you know, just small ones that I noticed, you know, but I didn't even know why they were, until I took him out there and they asked me a lot of questions about how he was, you know, acting, if he was, you know, acting strange; not too much, he didn't, you know.

REPORTER. His eyesight, has that been any result at all from lead poisoning, do you know?

Mrs. DREW. Yes, well this is what they tell me. Dr. Chan at Children's Hospital, that's what she tells me—that she explained to me what the lead poisoning can do, that it can cause brain damage, affect the eyes and, you know, whatever, and she says, you know, she wondered why he look like that and I told her, I said, well, as far as I know of it, it's just something that he acquired, that he, you know, and I never knew why and I didn't even try to find out, cause, to me, I never noticed him going down real far to pick up things, you know, before, so she had him take an eye examination and the doctor there he didn't say anything, just said he was a little cross-eyed so when he was in the hospital for the seven days they took more tests and they ran extra tests on him and they found out that he was far-sighted so, she said he'd have to have glasses and I couldn't believe a two year old kid who wears glasses. The thought of it!

REPORTER. Do you think your son's been rescued in time?

Mrs. DREW. Ya, I do. Yes, I do. And I'm, you know, it's bad that he took my nerve pill, but I'm glad that he did, you know, cause, like I said, . . .

REPORTER. That's the way you found out that he had lead poisoning.

Mrs. DREW. Lead poisoning, yea, or he'd be dead, you know, and I'd never know or he

could continue eating the paint and I'd never know anything about it, you know, so I'm thankful. I guess it was the Lord's way of showing it, you know, something was wrong. And I've talked to another girlfriend of mine; her son the same thing, and she found out accidentally her child ate some furniture oil and that's the only way she found out, you know, I, you know, it's hard to detect, she kept taking him for checkups and all that.

REPORTER. Almost all of the known lead poisoning cases in Milwaukee have been treated at Children's Hospital. Dr. Frederick Blodgett is the Director of Clinics at Children's and Professor of Pediatrics at the Wisconsin School of Medicine. Blodgett has spent many years working with lead poisoning and was instrumental in New Haven, Connecticut in developing a comprehensive lead poisoning program there.

Dr. FREDERICK BLODGETT. It's usually the child that has an infection or some other kind of problem that brings him to the hospital. Then in the process of questioning and learning about the child's history we ask if he eats paint—if they have ever noticed this. This is highly suspicious and we look for lead poisoning.

REPORTER. Is this frustrating for you: realizing that you're only seeing the tip of the iceberg?

BLODGETT. Yes, it is frustrating; it makes us realize that there are many children that don't get recognized as early as would be in their best interests.

REPORTER. If so many children are presumed to be suffering from lead poisoning, why are so few brought in?

BLODGETT. I think that it may be the symptoms that the child has—pain in the abdomen, constantly irritable behavior, weakness pallor—are just not recognized as being due to any abnormality in his health, and that therefore he doesn't get to the hospital where it could be recognized.

REPORTER. Until recently, all children with high blood levels had to be hospitalized. There were no provisions for treating them on an outpatient basis. Fortunately, Federal money does cover most of the medical costs for poor families under Title 19 of the Medicare bill. But a family of six near the poverty level with an income over \$4700—they will have to pay their own expenses that could run as high as \$1000. Now Children's Hospital runs a monthly Lead Poisoning Clinic open for treatment of follow-up cases and examination of suspected lead poisonings. Blood tests and X-Rays form the basis for treatment. And social workers are also available for counseling sessions with parents.

Mrs. NUNLEY (Mother of Lead Poisoned Child). He got a piece of paint chip in his eye and I brought him in because I couldn't get it out, and when I brought him in, they took him up to the Eye Clinic and got the paint chip out and they asked me had he been eatin' it, and I said yes and brought him back down to Medical and then I had to carry him up to X-Ray and...

KAMMHOLZ. The eye doctor then was aware of the lead poisoning problem?

Mrs. NUNLEY. No.

KAMMHOLZ. Apparently?

Mrs. NUNLEY. No. No, he didn't.

KAMMHOLZ. Well, at least he suggested that he be tested. Had you known that he was eating any before?

Mrs. NUNLEY. Well, not really, until I seen something white around his mouth.

KAMMHOLZ. Uh huh, when was that, that you first noticed?

Mrs. NUNLEY. Gosh, about six weeks. Every place that I go to is worse than the one I'm in.

KAMMHOLZ. Every place that you go to is worse? You mean there's chips laying around and...

Mrs. NUNLEY. Not only that; there was big holes in the wall and the paint is peeling off and...

KAMMHOLZ. Uh huh, do you have anybody that can give you any help to find a decent place? Or do you have a social worker or anything like that?

Mrs. NUNLEY. I have a case worker.

KAMMHOLZ. You have a case worker, huh? (To aides) Has she been approached at all? Does anybody know?

Mrs. NUNLEY. No.

KAMMHOLZ. Has Social Services been contacted yet about Mrs. Nunley? Well, this is a difficulty; we must find a home for the child that is free of these conditions, and this is very difficult at times. But this is a not uncommon problem; we get into the problem and then we go back into the same house that is causing the problem. Are you able to keep an eye on the child all the time?

Mrs. NUNLEY. Yeah. I'm able to keep an eye on him all the time.

KAMMHOLZ. What do you do when you see him eating paint chips?

Mrs. NUNLEY. I just stop him and slap his hands, lately...

KAMMHOLZ. Has he seemed to respond to this at all?

Mrs. NUNLEY. To tell you now, well, since he's come home from the clinic, he's I mean from the hospital, he doesn't bother it anymore. I guess he got enough of those shots, and me out here.

Dr. STEVE SHELLOV (Fourth Year Medical Student at Milwaukee Children's Hospital): This is the X-Ray of Duane Nunley when he was admitted to the hospital, and I'm not sure that you can appreciate, but there are little specks, white solid specks in his intestine that show up here and up here and also over here, and these indicate areas of lead, lead containing particles, probably plaster chips which were ingested by him and which would be, several days after this, absorbed by him into his blood stream and which would add to the lead burden, which meaning the amount of lead that he has in his body at the time. The treatment which he then had to undergo, in 5 days in the hospital, was to have the amount—this lead—and his intestines cleaned out, really, using a type of cathartic, so that this amount of lead would not be absorbed, and then he was given a series of 5 days of injections of a type of substance which combines with the lead and allows it not to be harmful to the child.

ALAN WOLKENSTEIN (Social Worker): It's these kinds of things that I would cover as a social worker in working with the family, and I wasn't able to interview mother when Duane was in the hospital so this is really our first chance, and I think there are some real definite kinds of things to be looked into, and Duane was eating other things than paint. Right mother?

Mrs. NUNLEY. Junk off the floor and wood and...

WOLKENSTEIN. O.K. Crayons? Now equally significant was that the other kids didn't do this...

Mrs. NUNLEY. No.

WOLKENSTEIN. Just this child, your youngest one.

Mrs. NUNLEY. Right.

REPORTER. In many cities, community groups have organized their own fight against lead poisoning, impatient with the time it takes government's wheels to turn. In Milwaukee, the 27th Street People Free Health Center has started a limited screening and treatment program. Now relocated at 1348 North 27th Street, the Center is in the process of organizing community people to distribute leaflets about lead poisoning and then hopefully to convince the parents to permit screening of their small children.

Identifying the child and treating him is

only one part of the lead poisoning problem. Far more important is what to do about the source of lead—the home. And, lead poisoning, unlike our other diseases, is rooted in all of the conditions that have created our ghettos. Poor families, crowded into deteriorating homes owned by absentee landlords, many of whom do only the minimum required of them.

Then, too, many of these families move often and it's difficult for owners and government agencies to catch up with the family to do something about the home. But something must be done or the child falls victim to the same conditions, and too many of the cases treated by doctors at Children's Hospital are repeats.

In Milwaukee, the responsibility for deciding what to do about getting the lead out of the home is a shared one. Different bureaus of the same department—the Department of Building Inspection—must make separate inspections and investigations. First health specialists from the Environmental Health Bureau go into the home to determine the source of the lead poisoning, in this case, the home of two year old Marvel Staples.

Mrs. STAPLES. He has a friend that lives on the second floor and they, the two of them, get together and they like to go up here in the hallway and play because we're cleaning the apartment. This is right where I think Marvel picked up this. Here they take the comb, they take their toys and they go up and down the steps and they chop. But this is where I think Marvel got tasting from.

REGINALD SMITH (Inspector, Environmental Health Bureau). There is plenty of loose and flaking paint on the wall here.

Mrs. STAPLES. Yah, he like to take his finger and do this, you know, and...

SMITH. We try to take as little plaster as possible because we have found that the plaster that doesn't contain lead will only serve to dilute our sample. We are looking forward to the time when we have an instrument that we can apply directly to the wall which will give us the lead content in the paint directly without having to go through an extensive laboratory analysis of the paint. Generally, we try to gather about a gram of sample here to give the chemist enough to work on. And what we often look for is peeling paint where it's at the level of where a small child could reach it and bite on it. Commonly this is on the porch railing that you see here and the paint in some areas is loose and flaking and easily accessible to a 3 year old or 4 year old. If, first of all, when we investigate one of these cases we find that there is perhaps a violation of the housing code with regard to the exterior maintenance and some of the interior as well, we refer this to the agency responsible for enforcing the housing code. And they make their inspections and issue the orders that are necessary to bring the dwelling into compliance.

REPORTER. Would you consider this a violation of the housing code?

SMITH. I would think that this certainly borders on it.

REPORTER. Smith's samples then go to the health bureau's laboratories for analysis. There, lab specialists can determine exactly how much lead was in the chips that Marvel Staples was eating. Smith and the health inspectors take samples of anything that might have a considerable amount of lead and sometimes the results are surprising. The samples taken at Marvel Staples' home turned up a toothpaste tube that registered 98% lead. But that is an isolated case—the most damaging evidence is in the chips themselves and the tests confirm that the Staples' West Garfield home was ripe with lead.

Seven to ten days later, the average time

it takes the health bureau to complete an inspection and to get its samples analyzed, still another government agency must enter the picture, the Building Maintenance Inspectors. They have the power to judge whether housing conditions noted by health inspectors, in their opinion, violate local housing ordinances and to recommend what course of action the landlord should take. There are no specific provisions in local ordinances dealing with lead poisoning so the building inspectors decide whether to apply section 51—the loosely worded provision that establishes minimum standards for maintenance of housing in Milwaukee. The Building Maintenance Bureau's Ralph Malecki contends that his staff members perform their jobs aggressively and fairly.

RALPH MALECKI (Assistant Supervisor, Building Maintenance Bureau). Our men, when they do get in, have to make a judgment, and we train them to make judgments. They have to set some sort of standards in their mind when they get this job as to what is clean and what is dirty. They must know the difference certainly between litter and dirt. Again, Mr. Owen, this is all symptomatic: these things go hand in hand. We don't find many lead poisoning cases outside the inner city.

REPORTER. But the houses aren't forty years old, are they?

MALECKI. That's correct. That's correct. In some areas they are, but there again, they have been maintained.

REPORTER. Are you implying it's a people problem?

MALECKI. Yes, it's a people problem.

REPORTER. Are you sufficiently tough in this department?

MALECKI. I think our record in court speaks for itself. Last year we had over 2,000 court cases, and this is something that's hard to explain too. We've been in the business literally from 1958 on and our court cases are going up. The amount of court cases . . .

REPORTER. These aren't just lead poisoning?

MALECKI. No, these aren't just lead poisoning, but to answer your question . . .

REPORTER. How many of these are lead poisoning, do you feel?

MALECKI. I can think of only one this year. I could be mistaken, there might be more, but I can think of one that was as a matter of fact dismissed in court.

REPORTER. In the federal grant proposal, the portion of it prepared by this department, you talk about relying on 1127 in the Milwaukee Code. . . .

MALECKI. Yes.

REPORTER. Something that's not been done too extensively before. If this is available, why haven't you used it? And why have you continued to use section 51 which is more lenient?

MALECKI. I think because we weren't aware of the lead poisoning situation until actually about a year ago. We had no communications, or very few up till now. In my experience, in 10 years, with the department, I have had only one, working in the field, that I remember. It's just something that has come to light. It's something certainly that has been identified, and there is this hiatus. What it's about I don't know, but again we're just like firefighters and policemen: we come out only after the fact.

REPORTER. Why this additional step? Why couldn't we work it out in Milwaukee where your health inspectors could do everything at one time?

Dr. E. R. KRUMBEIGEL (Commissioner of Health). Well, I don't know if you are aware of the fact that the responsibility for enforcement of the housing code was vested with the Milwaukee Health Department until, I believe, it was the 21st of December of 1968, at which time the responsibility for enforcement of the housing code and all of the

personnel associated with enforcement were transferred to the Building Inspection Department as a part of a more wide spread consolidation, which also involved the Fire Department. Now I opposed some aspects of this type of consolidation and if you want to ask me why it happened, I think I would have to refer you to the Common Council.

REPORTER. Wouldn't you agree that this is a rather awkward additional step, that this could be done by your inspectors?

KRUMBEIGEL. Yes, I certainly agree, but, of course, I did not recommend the transfer and I agree with you that it does pose some problems, because the same individual from the Health Department who goes in to obtain the paint scrapings or the plaster material and evaluate the lead hazard, if he had the legal authority as he would have had prior to 1968, he could then issue the notices or prepare the notices for issuance right at the same time.

REPORTER. But there is considerable question about the quality of the repair work done by landlords and whether or not the Building Maintenance Inspectors do bring sufficient pressure on them. After the Staples family moved out of their West Garfield house, another family with two small children moved in.

MALECKI. I myself went by the house and talked to the District Inspector. By the time he got there, the Staples family had already moved and to his knowledge the source—the hall and the porch—had been taken care of in the interim between the Staples moving—going to their other place. . . .

REPORTER. But has it been taken care of now?

MALECKI. To the best of my knowledge, I'm quite sure.

REPORTER. Taking of it resulted in this repair job. In the back stairs area, that had been a major source of lead poisoning for Marvel Staples, the landlord simply repainted the peeling surface instead of scraping, sanding and then repainting. Buckets were left in the kitchen, and, in the bedroom; this potentially dangerous lead paint condition was ignored. This was taking care of it, and it satisfied the Building Inspector. There are other examples.

Mrs. DREW. Look at this place, I mean it's still chipping and peeling off and when the child comes outside, I got to watch him so he don't get any of this stuff off of here, you know, to make sure he don't get anymore and it's supposed to be done and I want to know why it isn't.

REPORTER. How about inside where he got the lead poisoning initially?

Mrs. DREW. Well, inside, it's not done either and it's got to be done.

REPORTER. What does the landlord say when you mention this?

Mrs. DREW. All he says is he's not supposed to do it. He said, no, they didn't tell me to do this; all they told me was to paint the windowsill. So that's all he painted and that's coming off again, you know, and I don't think it was done properly.

REPORTER. You think Ladell is in any danger of getting it again?

Mrs. DREW. Yes, I do. I mean, I have to watch him but still I can't watch him 24 hours, he's got to play, but I can't tie him down. He might do it again, you know, and it's supposed to be lead-free paint and all this and why it isn't and how come it's not done like they said it's supposed to be done. Cause, you know, it's a problem to have to worry about him all the time and I want him to be able to go out and play like he wants to without me saying Ladell don't do this, Ladell, don't do that, you know. Can't go by the window or anything. I don't know why they don't do it right, you know. Like the Building Inspector and the Health Department and all them—they're supposed to be on the man's case about it and I don't

know if they're doing their job or not, you know. It's possible they're not doing it.

REPORTER. But, you feel the net result is that you're afraid for Ladell?

Mrs. DREW. Yes, I am, yes, I am. And I talked to the lady; I talked to her last week and told her about it and she said it's not her job to do this. She said five years ago the house was painted, so big deal. It's got to be painted again.

REPORTER. The landlord, Mrs. Anthony Farina, was asked to comment on film about Mrs. Drew's statement. She declined to do so, saying that she had done everything the Building Inspector had told her to do. But some landlords do more than is expected of them. Mrs. Nunley, who complained that every place she moved was worse than the last, got this response. The landlord removed every possible threat of lead poisoning to her small son Duane by paneling the entire house.

Disturbing, too, is the fact the bureaucracy seems to get in the way of removing the lead. In a number of cases, this reporter found that the Building Maintenance Inspection Bureau on Madison Street could produce no copy of the report and recommendations forwarded to them by the Environmental Health Inspectors. Yet, the health bureau's files showed the copies had been sent to him.

Still the Building Inspectors apparently had communicated with landlords because in some cases completed work was indicated. But there were also a number of examples of cases that showed nothing had been done and no record even of the inspections being made.

What about the communication between your department and the Health Department? In checking your files, I find that so many cases that we looked at there that there wasn't a copy of the letter that supposedly comes to your department from the Health Department. How can you make an investigation if you don't have the information?

MALECKI. I can't really explain the gap in communications. It could be any number of things; human error, misfiling. Too often we just don't find out about it. However, Dr. Krumbiegel had initiated action to solicit federal aid in this program whereby we would be part of a team working throughout the city.

REPORTER. Now, that's still pretty much in the future and assumes a lot of things—federal funding. But at present, don't you feel then that there is a problem because how can you then take action on a home if you don't have the information from the Health Department?

MALECKI. That's quite correct. I don't know how to explain it. If we had these things—if we got these things just as soon as from Children's Hospital and/or the Health Department after their tests, we'd send a man out there running.

REPORTER. Have you taken steps to try to find out why there is this gap?

MALECKI. Yes, I have taken . . . I got to go off the record. Yeah, and nothing comes of it. I wish that this would, uh . . . can this be cut out?

REPORTER. Well, I'll just ask you the question again and you'll just have to answer it then. Have you taken steps to try to find out why there is a gap here in communication?

MALECKI. Yes, I have taken steps to do this on an informal basis. There has been no correspondence through departments. But, yes, we have at least consulted some people in the Health Department that we feel might be responsible.

KRUMBEIGEL. Well, I think the inspections were made by the Building Inspection Department and, certainly, they did receive communications from this department. They would not have known that they should go out and look at them if they did not receive a communication.

REPORTER. But why this?

KRUMBIEGEL. As I understand the problem when the communications from the Health Department go to the Building Inspections Department, they are turned over to the District Inspector to alert him of the need to go out and visit the premises and they do not end up back in the Building Inspection file.

REPORTER. There is much Milwaukee can learn from Chicago's six year old lead poisoning program. Next to New York it screens and treats more small children than any other city in the country. Both those inside and outside the Daley organization will tell you that regardless of what you think about the Mayor, you have to acknowledge his commitment to a lead poisoning program and the fact that he backed up that commitment with money, money initially diverted from other federal programs along with corporate money that he raised.

When the screening and treatment program began, health officials found that 5% of the children there were lead poisoned. Now wider screening and faster treatment have resulted in less than a 2% rate of lead poisoning in Chicago.

Dr. Herbert Slutsky, an epidemiologist with the Chicago Board of Health, coordinates the lead poisoning program for the city.

Dr. HERBERT SLUTSKY. (Epidemiologist, Chicago Board of Health): In Chicago, since 1966, we have evidence on the basis of our screening program and for the last few years we have been screening approximately 50,000 children a year, that of 50,000 children last year in Chicago approximately 10% of those children had an elevated blood lead level.

REPORTER. What does that mean to their future?

SLUTSKY. It could, in essence, really, if not checked, could very much mean that they would have no future or their future would be such that in our society they would never be a producer, they would only be a taker.

The key is to get to the child before he develops serious symptoms or symptoms of lead poisoning. Now, the Health Department reaches these children through "outreach people" and I believe in Chicago we have demonstrated the value and utilization of "outreach people" such as the community representatives who are assigned to urban progress centers, basically social action oriented centers.

REPORTER. What we see here?

SLUTSKY. What we see in this center here, the Montrose Urban Progress Center, serving primarily a Spanish speaking community.

REPORTER. Chicago's lead clinic is open twice a week and the night this report was filmed, over 125 children from the largely Spanish speaking Northwest side of Chicago either came or were brought to this Center to have blood samples taken. The doctor takes about 10 cc's of blood for the lead test. This amount of blood permits health officials to run other tests too; sickle cell in Black areas. And also they can see if present immunization levels are adequate.

Some health officials—including some in Milwaukee—are skeptical about this blood testing system. They feel that by taking this much blood they scare the children and they make it impossible to get them back for further treatment. But if there is pain, it's fleeting, and the children we observed seemed to cry more from what they expected than what they felt.

Full scale screening programs like the one in Chicago don't automatically guarantee success in preventing lead poisoning tragedies. And several weeks ago Chicago recorded its first lead poisoning death of the summer. But at least Chicago's "outreach people" out in the communities doing the screening, know their neighborhoods well enough to keep track of potential lead poisonings.

Many times it means convincing the parent that eating paint chips is harmful; that they must stop their children from doing it.

This was this "outreach workers" third visit to this transplanted Appalachian family's home. Six year old Michael had already been treated for lead poisoning once, but the mother had not brought him back for follow-up tests. What the "outreach worker" found—along with Dr. Slutsky—who doesn't normally make these visits—was a shocking example of a child who may already be beyond help.

SLUTSKY. That tastes better to me than that plaster. Do you ever suck your thumb, Mike? I was a thumb sucker, I sucked a thumb a long time.

MICHAEL'S MOTHER. I've never had a thumb sucker.

SLUTSKY. All right, now, Michael, you've been eating plaster in this bedroom. Now, will you show me Michael, where you've been eating plaster, show me on the wall where you've been eating plaster. Uh huh, that one. Any other place on that wall you've been eating plaster? What do you do when you eat the plaster? Do you pick it out of the wall? Do you? Really?

MICHAEL. I take a hammer and crack it.

SLUTSKY. You take a hammer and crack it. Where else do you pick? Do you pick any plaster up on the floor?

MICHAEL. When I crack it, I take it around.

SLUTSKY. Oh, I see, and then what do you do when you crack it? What do you do with it?

MICHAEL. I eat it.

SLUTSKY. You eat it. Do you like the taste of it? Right! What does it taste like? Does it taste sweet? Does it? Do you like to chew it? Show me in your mouth, where do you do, put it in your mouth? Huh? Where do you sleep, Michael? Right over there? When you're in bed do you ever chew any plaster, eat any plaster in bed? Really? Where? Where do you do that at, Michael?

MICHAEL. Over there.

SLUTSKY. Where? Over here? Show me where, son! Come show the doctor where. I know that's your bed, but show me where is your plaster? Where do you hide the plaster? Do you hide any plaster by you, underneath there? And then when you are in bed, what do you do, reach under there and take it out? Well, how do you get it?

MICHAEL. I keep it under there.

SLUTSKY. You keep it under there! Uh huh, o.k. How old are you Michael? Five? Four? You gonna be. When are you going to be five? In July?

REPORTER. While Chicago has a tougher, more specific ordinance dealing with lead poisoning, the problem there, as elsewhere, is enforcement. The lower courts are overloaded and housing violations don't take top priority. So, removing the lead from the home remains a monumental problem. But Chicago has begun experimenting with a procedure that sidesteps the courts, permits the building inspectors to take action immediately on landlords who don't make repairs. And, importantly, one inspector, not two from different bureaus, handle lead poisoning cases.

SLUTSKY. When we first started the expanded screening program, we were amazed, continually amazed at the fact that the overwhelming majority of parents had no knowledge as to the cause of lead poisoning. In the last five, six years, we have carried out extensive, educational program through "outreach people" the community representatives, working out of their assigned urban progress centers such as we have observed here at the Montrose Urban Progress Center today.

REPORTER. What about literally getting the lead, the lead out of those walls?

SLUTSKY. The Building Department in Chicago is an aggressive, action oriented pro-

gram designed to assist landlords, motivate landlords, to bring their properties in compliance with the code, especially if investigation reveals that lead is present in a residential dwelling in excess of more than 1%. The Building Department stands prepared to assist landlords, providing them with the advice on how to get about making repairs. Urban progress centers are holding rap sessions with landlords, assisting them also, providing advice under Building Department direction and guidance and how to make the necessary repairs. And, if necessary, if the landlord, for some reason, does not make the necessary repairs, then the Building Department in the City of Chicago contracts for services with a nonprofit organization which will actually go into the apartment, make the necessary repairs and then the City of Chicago bills the landlord for the cost of the renovation for the services provided by the, by this organization.

REPORTER. Chicago has also taken the leadership in exploring what many lead poisoning experts feel is the key to understanding why many kids eat paint chips in the first place: the condition of pica. This mysterious craving for non-nutritional substances, paint and plaster being the most common. But surprisingly enough, there has been virtually no research done on pica and that makes the study underway in Chicago right now that much more significant. Here in Milwaukee, Dr. Blodgett firmly believes that pica is a major factor in lead poisoning.

REPORTER. Then if we solve pica, will we solve lead poisoning? If we found out exactly what caused pica?

BLODGETT. Well, we would go a long way toward solving it, but lead poisoning can come from a high content of lead in the water and in food, and through inhalation of fumes from factories burning lead.

REPORTER. But, what about the basic ingestion problem?

BLODGETT. The basic ingestion problem we'd solve and that's the major source.

REPORTER. Well, then, what about all these other efforts? Are they meaningless, absent of a corresponding effort to solve pica?

BLODGETT. You mean efforts to improve housing? I think not, I think that efforts to get lead away from places where children can get it is a very worthwhile thing. A lot of pica can be indulged in satisfactorily and safely as long as it does not contain harmful substances. Many paints are produced that don't contain lead and therefore are safe to use in houses.

REPORTER. How much do we really know, then, about pica?

BLODGETT. We know that it's a very common trait especially among children; that most children outgrow it, that, I guess, beyond that we don't really know very much about the psychological factors that lead to it.

REPORTER. Well, then, there are more factors than just the basic nutritional deficiencies?

BLODGETT. Yes, there are studies that show clearly that even when nutritional deficiencies have been corrected, pica may still continue.

REPORTER. Why?

BLODGETT. Perhaps because it has certain psychological satisfactions to children, just as smoking and other things with the mouth do for adults. I would think that these factors are important in the child's tendency to put things in his mouth, that he enjoys sucking on them, or chewing them, or likes the taste, and that gets some satisfaction from this.

REPORTER. The Federal Government has played a confusing game with cities like Milwaukee eager to take advantage of the recently passed Federal Lead Paint Poisoning Bill, a bill authorizing the spending of over thirty million dollars in the next two years to help local communities develop comprehensive lead poisoning programs. But as it

happens, all too often, the bill was never funded; no money for 1971, and reportedly the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has asked for only two million dollars for 1972. That wouldn't stretch very far divided up between the 50 cities already applying for lead poisoning money. In anticipation of Federal funds, Dr. Krumbeig has helped put together a comprehensive lead poisoning proposal, but he seems to have counted much too heavily on the availability of Federal money.

REPORTER. With the very unlikelihood of money, how are you going to get your program funded?

KRUMBEIGEL. Well, this is a very serious problem. Of course we could look toward the city of Milwaukee General Treasury in the hopes that the Common Council would appropriate some money—the amount—and carry out our program. However, because of the rather strapped financial condition in which the city finds itself, I'm not very optimistic about our ability to acquire the funds out of purely local taxation funds to mount what I would regard as an effective program. This leaves us then with the alternative of operating a program that would have some meaning, but would not attain the scope and tempo that I feel a real meaningful program should attain.

REPORTER. Have you tried to solicit private money as seed money? Apparently Chicago, along with several other cities, did this in conjunction with some other efforts. Have you tried that?

KRUMBEIGEL. No, we haven't tried that. We have been, of course, putting our eggs in the federal hope basket up to this point and until we find what we can get, it would seem rather futile for us to attempt to look for local money. There are many reasons for that; first of all the way we have laid out the program here it would encompass a period of five years, and I think that if one must focus on elimination of the sources of lead poisoning in the home and unless this is done, of course, the whole program becomes relatively futile viewed from a long range viewpoint.

REPORTER. Pursuing that point, what then is it going to take to perhaps get through the Common Council a much more stringent ordinance dealing with lead poisoning as a health hazard?

KRUMBEIGEL. Oh, I don't think there's a real problem there at all. I think the Common Council here would be willing to enact any type of reasonable legislation as long as they did not have to appropriate the money to carry out the program.

REPORTER. Where Dr. Krumbeigel rejects the idea of raising private funds to start a limited screening and detection program, others including Dr. Slutsky, insist it ought to be done, that it would demonstrate to the Federal Government when money is available that Milwaukee has first tapped all sources here. And most important, some children might be reached before permanent damage is done to them.

Others have suggested using Model Cities funds for lead poisoning. And certainly the machinery is here to involve community residents in a screening program. It's just unfortunate that so many known cases and suspected lead poisoning cases are outside the target area.

Other cities have seen fit to pass specific local ordinances declaring lead poisoning a major health hazard and spelling out clearly what must be done to make certain that no child is permitted to return to the same house where he got lead poisoning without repairs first being made.

But Milwaukee could fashion its own innovation too, for example, FHA could require all contractors to de-lead rehabilitated homes that are subsidized by Federal money.

Other forms of lead poisoning have also gotten considerable publicity in recent weeks, most notably lead poisoning caused by lead exhaust from cars. Now both the Surgeon General and the National Academy of Science documented lead exhausts effects on poor children who live near freeways. Other isolated cases include the toothpaste tube case reported earlier and the lead pencil poisoning in New York City.

But the overwhelming problem remains lead paint poisoning, and we don't do anything about it. If the victims were middle class kids, we must ask ourselves, would we continue to tolerate it? Our apathy about lead poisoning demonstrates too why poor people aren't too excited about the environmental movement. If environmentalists mean what they say about improving the quality of life for everyone they would protest lead poisoning the same way they protest mercury poisoning and extinction of the bald eagle. But until the time that lead poisoning becomes a major issue, these poor children will suffer the consequences and remain part of the city that might as well be: Zoned for Disease.

STUDIO DISCUSSION

REPORTER. Alderman Phillips, you're chairman of the Health-Traffic Committee and a member of the Common Council. Could the Council come up with the money for as serious a problem as this appears to be?

ALDERMAN VEL PHILLIPS. Oh, I think we could. I, of course, you know, that the cities are in desperate need in so far as money is concerned, but I think it's a matter of where you want to put your priorities. And I think that they could come up with the money necessary. Actually, it's \$350,000, which isn't a great deal of money; at least not for this kind of thing.

REPORTER. Would you be willing to take the leadership in something like this?

PHILLIPS. Oh, very definitely, very definitely. It's the more you know about it, the more you recognize that it really has reached epidemic proportions, and I think that the thing that amazes me most is that it's an entirely preventable disease and it's entirely manmade, and like many other things, it hits those sections of the community least able to deal with it; so I think that it's something that all too few people know a lot about. And there's no question in my mind that with the proper money and with education, we could lick it.

REPORTER. Professor Mangiamale, as an expert in Urban Affairs, a Professor of Urban Affairs and a City Planner, what does the city do when it's strapped in something like this? There are so many problems, so many priorities. Where does the city turn to for money? If it can't get Federal funds immediately, what else can it do?

MANGIAAMELE. Of course, funds—the question of funds is a very difficult question as to where the city turns. Generally, the city will, if it doesn't have money, can't change its priorities, as was mentioned earlier, it has to turn to other sources. I think Model Cities money was mentioned at one time, and one of the problems when you earmark funds, you can't turn it, turn it back. For example, I'm not sure that I'd be for the income sharing program that's being talked about now, but if we had that kind of money from the Federal Government, without any strings attached like there is in Model Cities, we could turn to that source for money. It was mentioned that Model Cities money would be available, but these poison belts are outside of the area. If there were some money coming from the Federal Government or if there were emergency money set up, then this could be done. For instance, if we could look at this as a completely, in a medical, take a medical approach to a social problem, that you had to concentrate your efforts on it, you had to take the money from

someplace else. That means a changing of priorities.

PHILLIPS. But the thing is; now for example, you said on the show that in—really it's just so, I don't know, despicable, really when government gives all the rhetoric and passes this kind of legislation as it did on the 14th of January and then doesn't appropriate any money to fund it, you know, so what does it mean? It means absolutely nothing. But if we just dealt specifically with say Model Cities money . . . by the way we have not really filed an application. Dr. Krumbeig says that our application for funds are ready to go, but Chicago's office has told us not to do it, because we have no money. But when you think that—and I don't know exactly how much; maybe \$50,000, maybe it's \$100,000, that goes into the producing of a Model Cities newspaper; can you imagine? As far as I'm concerned, that really shows where we put our priorities. Now, what good does it do to have a newspaper telling the people what they're getting or not getting in Model Cities when you could take that money and maybe save some lives with a program like the lead poisoning. I think that's an absolute, or at least a very good example of where we set our priorities.

MANGIAAMELE. Well, I agree that the setting of priorities is very important in lives. If we were concerned about saving the lives of individuals in our own families, we'd put that as top priority.

PHILLIPS. Yeah, a newspaper, a Model Cities newspaper, in competition with the Black newspapers in the Model Cities area, as a matter of fact, taking things from them, when it could be going to the lead poisoning program.

MANGIAAMELE. When you have things like brain damage occurring . . .

PHILLIPS. Right.

MANGIAAMELE. And there's the likelihood of brain damage occurring, all our resources ought to be aimed at that . . .

PHILLIPS. Everything.

MANGIAAMELE. And even housing, as much as I think that housing's a high priority, even that takes secondary priority to the actual loss or endanger, any kind of endanger to existing life.

PHILLIPS. Of course, there are other little things, like the film shows, that I think it's very important that the bureaucratic hang-ups, the trouble you have with getting landlords, really making them, forcing them to take care of that kind of thing, the tie-up in the courts, the whole bit; that all can be done; but more than that you need public attention, you need education and you need money, and when I see good Federal funds going towards something like a Model Cities newspaper or even this program where they're going around doing some kind of investigation as to the need for housing, you know. I can't remember that program, but there again, what do we need an agency set up to do statistics on whether or not we need better housing? We need that like we need a hole in the head.

REPORTER. It occurs to me too that there are many laws already on the books to be enforced, and we mentioned in the report and perhaps didn't clarify it enough, they've found, now, a new provision of the ordinance, Section 1127, and this might be of interest to you because it says, "whenever any nuisance, source of filth, or cause of sickness shall be found in private property, the Common Council or the Inspector of Buildings may order the owner or occupant, thereof, at his own expense, to remove this within 24 hours." So the Common Council apparently could take a more active role if other agencies wouldn't.

PHILLIPS. I fear, but, there has, first of all it says may order, but you . . . if that is so, you still have to get the actual Building

Inspection Inspectors Office or the Health Department to clamp down. You notice in your film, one of the gentlemen, I think from the Building Inspection said that the landlord had taken care of it when actually the landlord had not taken care of it. You see. So we've grown accustomed to, you know, not really following through in thinking that it's taken care of. You know, I think, and I certainly don't want to monopolize the conversation, but I guess I feel strongly about it, because it's like any other thing: like narcotics for example. That is not a new problem in the Black community, in the slum areas. This lead poisoning thing is directly a part of the ghetto life, of poor housing and all that kind of thing and until it effects, and if, only if it effected the white middle class America, would people really get excited about it.

MANGIAMELE. I would think right after this program, there should be something very specifically done in the Council, either a resolution or an ordinance passed to go all out to eliminate the . . . the lead paint poisoning, the effect it has. Because it's like a time bomb that was set in the 30's, that's now easily, very slowly giving off this toxin. And I think this ought to be done just as if you were the police force were to go out at a riot. Nobody would question where the money was coming from. The police force would be sent out. The Fire Department would be sent out when there's . . . when there's that kind of thing. This is that same kind of crisis where the city . . .

PHILLIPS. That's not a . . . that won't do any good, Joe I'm sorry . . .

MANGIAMELE. The city ought to go out and do something about this. . . .

PHILLIPS. All right, well then you need more than a resolution or anything like that, that's just paper rhetoric, the same thing that the Federal Government did . . .

MANGIAMELE. But they ought to direct somebody to . . .

PHILLIPS. You can't, that means nothing unless you've got some money, it simply means nothing . . .

REPORTER. Why doesn't, local government . . .

PHILLIPS. It simply means nothing, that's just beautiful rhetoric that we could sit here and say I'll pass, I'll introduce a resolution and this and that, but it won't mean anything.

MANGIAMELE. But where does the, where does the city get its money when the police work overtime for, because of riot situations?

PHILLIPS. Fine . . .

REPORTER. But you're saying you can get \$350,000 locally.

PHILLIPS. Oh, I think that, I think if the proper educational program was put through, if people really are alerted, community people to what—how dangerous and how bad this is—then I think we could get the \$350,000 in the budget, yes. Really when you think about it, as I said, a lot more money that that goes to a lot less important things, you see. Oh, I do.

MANGIAMELE. But, in other words, we can scrape it out of other things, too, and . . .

PHILLIPS. Right, we can dig it and get it, but it won't mean anything for me to introduce . . . it would pass; of course, it would pass, but the money, you have to have the money to back it up, you see. And I think I get personally weary of a lot of talk and no action, but that's all you got when you got the . . . can you imagine saying that we need 30 million to go to the cities and then the Federal Government putting nothing in 1971 and then putting . . . saying they're going to give 2 million in 1972.

REPORTER. Well thank you very much. We're going to have to interrupt at this point. We hope to see some action in the

Common Council. Thank you very much, both of you, for joining us on this special program. I'm John Owen. Good night.

CLOSING MONTAGE—VOICE OVER CREDITS

Audio is as follows:

Mrs. STAPLES. Well, when I saw him, he was peeling them off with his nails, but the day that I noticed him doing this and got him away from out there, out here, he was very active that morning and that evening he took a temperature all of a sudden so that made me thought lead. We always after him about putting even his dirty hands in his mouth or open a bottle or just tasting or anything that he wants to see what it is, you know.

KAMMHOFF. Because if a child goes back to the same environment, he is going to pick up more lead and come back worse than he was before. So we have to insure that the child is out of the problem area.

ART OF THE (ENVIRONMENTAL) POSSIBLE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent flurry of charges and countercharges over the administration's willingness to impose statutory pollution requirements, beclouds the hard facts of President Nixon's environmental record. As is perhaps becoming more clear, pollution abatement is not a simple matter to be solved by fiat, but rather a precarious balance between the Nation's health and welfare and the ability of the public and private sectors to finance pollution abatement, and the development of an essential spirit of cooperation between all concerned citizens and those who must do the hard and expensive work of controlling environmental contaminants.

The already impressive list of the Nixon administration's achievements may have created expectations which dismiss the political and economic realities to be dealt with each time new standards are formulated or new regulatory arms are created. But things are not that simple, and a good discussion of the not-so-simple process of environmental policy appears in the following New York Times article by Gladwin Hill, which I insert for the benefit of my colleagues:

NIXON'S POLLUTION FIGHT—CONTRADICTORY TACTICS RAISE QUESTIONS, BUT A RECORD OF SUCCESS IS FOUND

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES.—A standard police technique for eliciting information from reticent persons under interrogation is known as the "Mutt and Jeff" tactic.

Two officers, one harsh and one conciliatory, take turns in the questioning. Ultimately, through the interplay of fear and gratitude, the subject is inveigled into a degree of cooperation he initially resisted. Either by accident or design, a similar pattern has unfolded in the Nixon Administration's efforts to ameliorate industrial air and water pollution.

William D. Ruckelshaus, whom President Nixon appointed head of the Environmental Protection Agency, has willy-nilly assumed the "tough guy" role although he is personally unusually affable.

Mr. Ruckelshaus is the one who almost daily brandishes a metaphorical fist at various quarters of industry. Telling them they must shape up and promulgating stern standards for them to shape up to.

MORE THAN ONE JEFF

By contrast, various Administration luminaries take turns playing the "Jeff" role of soothing and reassuring industry and deploring what are depicted as undue pressures on it to clean up.

President Nixon himself, like the chief of detectives who pops in and out of the room to reinforce which ever phase of the interrogation seems to need it, oscillates in protean fashion between the militant and conciliatory roles.

Recurrently, as in his State of the Union speeches and various messages to Congress, he has issued ringing calls for environmental reform.

At other times, he has sought to mollify industry, by such moves as creating the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, an "advisory" panel of big business executives through which industry can tell its troubles to Government.

A vignette of the environmental Mutt and Jeff act occurred last February during a visit of pollution control council leaders to the White House. First they were sternly lectured by Mr. Ruckelshaus on the need to abate pollution, then moments later they were reassured by Mr. Nixon that nobody was going to "beat industry over the head" or make it a "scapegoat" for pollution.

The developing web of legislative and administrative moves against polluters is regularly counterpointed by conciliatory gestures. One week it will be a White House representative urging Congress to go slow on letting citizens sue polluters. The next week it will be Henrik Houthakker, a former Presidential economic adviser, saying we must be careful about the "social costs" of curbing pollution.

STANS BACKS INDUSTRY

The leading practitioner of the Jeff role is Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans, who at least once a month leaps conspicuously to industry's defense.

In May he told a businessmen's convention that "business is 99.44 per cent pure"—a figure that does not quite agree with the Council of Environmental Quality's assessment of factory effluents.

In June, Mr. Stans told a chemical association that the new Clean Air Act showed "complete disregard for economic factors" and contained "unrealistic technological demands."

Last Thursday he told a petroleum industry group that the nation was moving too fast and too stringently against things like DDT, phosphates and automobile fumes.

Some environmental zealots have suggested that all this zigzagging reflects crass hypocrisy or duplicity in the Administration's purported solicitude for environmental reform.

This contention, however, has some formidable factual obstacles to hurdle. For regardless of whether it is attributable to good intentions, good luck or irresistible trends, the Nixon Administration has compiled a historic environmental record.

Bobbles like being on the losing side in the supersonic transport controversy are eclipsed by many pulses—implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act, establishment of the Council on Environmental Quality, creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, halting of the Everglades jetport and cross-Florida canal projects, suspension of the Alaska pipeline and many another item.

And, monthly, weekly, or even daily blasts by Secretary Stans against the Clean Air Act,

for all the applause his words may evoke from business conventions, do not alter the terms of the act a whit.

Some politically oriented observers see Mr. Nixon as methodically trying to rack up Brownie points with both sides in pollution abatement hassle for the 1972 election.

Others, more familiar with the Mutt and Jeff tactic, see the contradictory themes in environmental reform as a textbook exercise in the politician's "art of the possible"—the reconciling of conflicting interests to obtain some forward motion.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Georgetown University Law Center I was especially pleased to note an excellent article which recently appeared in the Georgetown Law Weekly written by my good friend and distinguished colleague from Michigan, Congressman WILLIAM D. FORD. The article appeared on September 15, which incidentally, was the week during which the outstanding new law center was dedicated.

This article discussed the need for enforcement procedures for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and outlined the provisions of the bill, H.R. 1746, which was then pending before the House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, this body failed to adopt many of the provisions discussed in this article, and many of the problems to which Congressman FORD referred continue to exist.

I insert the text of Congressman FORD's article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE FORD OUTLINES 1970 EEOE ACT PROVISIONS

The Equal Employment Opportunities Enforcement Act of 1971 is scheduled for action in the House of Representatives this week. The basic purpose of this legislation is to grant the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) authority to issue, through well established procedures, judicially enforceable cease and desist orders. The bill would also broaden the EEOC's jurisdiction to provide relief for millions of additional employees and consolidate federal equal employment tools under the Commission.

Those of us in Congress who have consistently advocated the measures contained in this bill feel that passage of this legislation at this time is vital in order for this country to fulfill its obligation to provide equal employment opportunities for all its citizens.

CHARGES INCREASE EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was established under the authority of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII declared the right to be free from discrimination by employers, employment agencies and labor organizations and created the EEOC to oversee the enforcement of this right. Under the authority of Title VII, the Commission was not given the power to issue judicially enforceable orders but, in-

stead, its role was limited essentially to the function of conciliation.

The EEOC became effective on July 2, 1965, and since this time has made heroic efforts to reduce discrimination in employment. However, the experience of the past six years has demonstrated that the machinery created by Congress in 1964 has been unsuccessful in ending the job discrimination which continues to pervade our system.

An examination of the statistics with respect to the progress of equal employment opportunities clearly demonstrates that the voluntary approach has failed to eliminate employment discrimination. During the first six years of its existence, the Commission received more than 81,000 charges. Of these, 57,714 were recommended for investigation. Of this number approximately 56% involved complaints of discrimination because of race, 23% because of sex and the remainder involved charges of discrimination because of national origin or religion.

The number of charges has steadily increased every year since the inception of the EEOC. In Fiscal Year 1971, charges received by the Commission numbered more than twice as many as in Fiscal Year 1968 and almost four times as many as the number received in its first Fiscal Year, 1966. The evidence is overwhelming—the incidence of employment discrimination, despite the optimistic expectations which accompanied the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, has not declined.

The need for enforcement of the rights created by Title VII cannot be disputed. There is nothing in existing law which would lead anyone to expect that the present trend of rising employment discrimination will be reversed. With the limited authority available to it, the EEOC can hardly be expected to produce any better results in the future than it has in the past. Despite its continued efforts, the past record of accomplishment of the EEOC is quite disappointing in terms of eliminating discrimination, and this lack of achievement can be traced directly to the lack of enforcement power. For instance, of the 51,714 charges recommended for investigation by the Commission during its first six years, reasonable cause was found in over 63% of the cases. Yet, because of its lack of enforcement powers, the Commission was only able to accomplish totally or even partially successful conciliation in less than half of these cases.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Equal Employment Opportunities Act of 1971 does not represent the first attempt to provide the EEOC with enforcement powers. In fact, legislation designed to provide the Commission with "cease and desist" power has been introduced in every Congress since the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The most recent unsuccessful attempt to provide the Commission with enforcement powers occurred in the 91st Congress. In August 1970, we reported a "cease and desist" authority bill out of the House Education and Labor Committee, and the Senate passed a similar bill in October 1970. However, the House Rules Committee refused to clear the legislation for consideration on the floor of the House of Representatives, and the measure died at the end of the 91st Congress, despite a last minute attempt to free the bill from the Rules Committee by means of a discharge petition.

On June 2 of this year, the House Education and Labor Committee reported out the Equal Employment Opportunities Act of 1971 after defeating a series of amendments offered by Republican members of the Committee. The most comprehensive amendment, offered by Rep. John N. Erlenborn (R.-Ill.), is expected to be offered on the floor as a substitute for the Committee bill. The Erlenborn substitute would provide for court enforcement power rather than "cease and

desist" power for the Commission. The substitute bill also contains provisions which would restrict the amount of back awards, make Title VII an exclusive remedy, and prohibit class actions.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

Those of us in the House of Representatives who support the Equal Employment Opportunities Enforcement Act of 1971 feel that this legislation is one of the most comprehensive and vital improvements ever proposed.

In addition to strengthening the EEOC's authority, the bill would also broaden the scope of the Commission and consolidate existing federal equal employment tools.

The jurisdictional coverage of the EEOC would be broadened to include employees of State and local governments. Educational related employees—primarily teachers—would also be covered under the new provisions. There are presently approximately 10.1 million persons employed by State and local governments and 2.1 million teachers employed by public elementary and secondary schools. Under present law, these employees are exempt from the provisions of Title VII.

In consolidating other presently existing federal equal employment tools under the EEOC, the Equal Employment Opportunities Enforcement Act of 1971 would: transfer the functions and responsibilities of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance from the Department of Labor to the EEOC; make the EEOC responsible for insuring equal employment opportunities throughout the federal civil service system; and transfer the Attorney General's authority to initiate "pattern or practice" suits to the EEOC.

The transfer of the functions of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance would be particularly desirable in light of the fact that the OFCC is addressed to the same basic mission as the EEOC—the elimination of discrimination in employment. Since this is the exclusive mission of the EEOC, those of us who support the present legislation feel that the functions of the OFCC could be better performed by the EEOC and will result in the improvement of both the contract compliance program and the Title VII program.

Making the EEOC responsible for ensuring equal employment opportunities throughout the federal civil service system would also be a great improvement over the existing system. Presently, the Civil Service Commission is responsible for the Federal government's equal employment opportunity program. In essence, this means that the agency responsible for administering government hiring policies is the same agency charged with the responsibility for investigating and passing judgment on government hiring policies. It is obvious that any system which permits an agency to sit in judgment over its own practices and procedures, which themselves may raise questions of systematic discrimination, contains a built-in conflict-of-interest.

The third provision of the bill relating to the consolidation of federal equal employment measures is the section dealing with the transfer of "pattern or practice" suit authority from Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice to the EEOC. In considering this provision, the Committee on Education and Labor determined that, due to increased responsibilities in areas such as public accommodation, public facilities, schools, housing, discrimination in federally assisted programs and voting discrimination, the Civil Rights Division has been limited in the number and the nature of suits which it has been able to file. For these reasons, the Committee has determined that the Justice Department has been unable to pursue Title VII suits with the vigor and intensity necessary to reduce the wide-spread prevalence of systematic discrimination and that the authority to initiate "pattern or practice" suits

could be utilized to a greater extent if it was vested in the EEOC.

BASIC PURPOSE: ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING LAWS

In summary, the Equal Employment Opportunities Enforcement Act of 1971 is by far the most far-reaching, comprehensive bill to be considered by Congress in the area of enforcement of equal employment opportunity laws. Yet its basic purpose is merely to provide better assurance for the enforcement of presently existing laws, rather than to create any new ones.

The rights created by this bill are procedural in nature rather than substantive. The major feature of the Equal Employment Opportunities Enforcement Act would merely empower the EEOC, after it has exhausted the procedures which are now available to it for achieving voluntary compliance, to issue complaints, hold hearings, issue cease and desist orders against illegal discriminatory employment practices, and seek enforcement orders in the Federal Courts. It should be noted that similar powers are presently exercised by most federal regulatory agencies, and that it is only logical and equitable to provide minorities and women with the same forms of protection by the EEOC that we now provide for consumers through the Federal Trade Commission, investors through the Securities and Exchange Commission, and workers through the National Labor Relations Board.

The time has come to bring an end to job discrimination once and for all, and to ensure every citizen the opportunity for the decent self-respect that accompanies a job commensurate with one's abilities. The Equal Employment Opportunities Act of 1971 can help provide the assurance that protection of the rights of millions of Americans sought by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act will be accomplished once and for all.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the recently concluded Minneapolis health hearings, testimony was received from Mr. John F. Lannon, the administrator of Divine Redeemer Memorial Hospital in South St. Paul, Minn.

The following statements indicate the important role that Catholic hospitals play in providing medical care in the United States. The objectives and philosophy for Catholic hospitals is extremely well developed in the following statements:

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES: THE CATHOLIC HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION

OBJECTIVE I

To provide leadership to Catholic health organizations in the promotion of Christian community and the dignity of man.

1. By identifying social and ethical concerns to which Catholic health organizations should address themselves.

2. By encouraging deliberate programs of concern and commitment in response to human needs.

3. By providing services to assist Catholic health organizations to define and respond to their communities' needs.

OBJECTIVE II

To analyze and interpret to Catholic health organizations trends and developments in the health field.

1. By identifying and establishing ongoing contact with centers of information on health problems and progress made in meeting health needs.

2. By collecting, analyzing, and interpreting pertinent data which will be of assistance to Catholic health organizations.

3. By dissemination through appropriate media the analysis and interpretation of such data:

OBJECTIVE III

To contribute to the development and provision of optimal health programs and services by Catholic health organizations.

1. By giving guidance in achieving effective corporate organization and legal structures.

2. By giving direction in the improvement of institutional organization and management.

3. By assisting in upgrading and expanding the criteria for measurement of standards of care.

4. By encouraging and promoting innovations and experiments in methods of providing programs and services.

OBJECTIVE IV

To represent and express the interests of Catholic health organizations to private and public agencies and organizations.

1. By referring appropriate matters to the United States Catholic Conference for guidance and counsel.

2. By presenting the Association's position to other health organizations and agencies.

3. By expressing the particular concerns of Catholic health organizations to religious and civil authorities.

A PHILOSOPHY FOR CATHOLIC HOSPITALS

In this seventh decade of the twentieth century it is important for Catholic hospitals to re-evaluate their objectives and functions that they may direct their resources most effectively toward the goals which are properly theirs. This statement, then, is both a standard and measure of purposes recorded in terms of the continuing health needs of modern society.

1. Catholic hospitals are an integral part of the work of the Church. They are the extension of Christ's mission of mercy.

2. Catholic hospitals recognize man's unique composition of body and soul. Their concept of total care, therefore, embraces the physical, emotional and spiritual needs of each patient.

3. The primary objective of Catholic hospitals is to maintain and restore health.

4. As Christ's love for man impelled the Church to establish hospitals, so they, in turn, must serve all men in charity, regardless of race, creed, or financial status.

5. Total care can be attained only through a formal organization which utilizes principles of management long embodied in the operation of the Church and generally accepted and refined by private institutions.

6. Hospital management has an obligation to provide those it serves with the best possible care through the best available resources.

7. The governing board, with proper medical advice, has an obligation to select for the medical staff, qualified and conscientious physicians, and to give them the cooperation and assistance necessary for the practice of good medicine. It is also important to provide an adequate and competent staff of nurses and technical personnel.

8. The continued competence of personnel at all levels and in all areas is an obligation of justice for hospitals, because they render care through people.

9. Hospital personnel deserve in justice to be treated with respect for their personal worth and dignity; therefore, Catholic hospitals should work toward a program of compensation and working conditions which reflects the spirit of social justice.

10. Donations made to a hospital and moneys received for patient care belong in justice to the hospital. They may not be diverted to other purposes.

11. Each hospital has an obligation to further education and research according to available resources.

12. Each hospital is a community facility and should actively participate in community planning for health and medical care facilities and should operate in accord with the needs of the community it serves.

This *Philosophy* was one of several resolutions passed by delegates to the 47th Annual Convention.

STATISTICS CONCERNING CATHOLIC HOSPITALS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1969

Number of hospitals.....	796
Short term general.....	632
Short term general with long term care unit.....	127
Short and long term special.....	37
Number of beds.....	159,608
Short term.....	152,296
Long term.....	7,312
Number of admissions.....	5,579,589
Number of patient days.....	47,620,741
Short term.....	44,886,885
Long term.....	2,733,856
Births.....	659,490
Average percent of occupancy.....	79.1
Average length of stay (days).....	8.2

	Number	Percent
Distribution of bed size:		
Under 50 beds.....	90	11.3
50 to 99 beds.....	133	16.7
100 to 199 beds.....	242	30.4
200 to 299 beds.....	159	20.0
300 to 399 beds.....	90	11.3
400 to 499 beds.....	49	6.2
500 beds and over.....	31	4.1

Administrators in Catholic hospitals:	
Lay.....	150
Religious.....	646
Average number of personnel per bed.....	2.2
National average for voluntary nonprofit hospitals.....	2.2
Average number of personnel per bed:	
Catholic.....	2.2
All voluntary nonprofit.....	2.2
Average number of personnel per patient (based on daily census):	
Catholic.....	2.6
All voluntary nonprofit.....	2.8

THE CATHOLIC HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION, St. Louis, Mo., November 23, 1970.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR: The Report of the 1970 Annual Meeting of the CHA House of Delegates, sent to all CHA members early in July, 1970, included the *Statement on Respect for Life* which has been approved by both the CHA Board of Trustees and the House of Delegates. The *Statement* was also published in the June 10 *CHA Convention Daily* and in the August issue of *HOSPITAL PROGRESS*. A copy of the *Statement* is attached. I am bringing the *Statement* to your attention again for four reasons:

First, the relatively large number of questions we are receiving from member institutions concerning abortion and the CHA position on this issue indicate that the *Statement* may have been overlooked by or not brought to the attention of individuals in leadership positions in member institutions. We hope that this re-distribution of the *Statement* will resolve many of these questions.

Second, we recommend that, in accordance with a suggestion in the *Statement*, each institution review and discuss the *Statement*, if it has not already done so. Each hospital board could climax this analysis by officially re-affirming the institution's commitment to give witness to the dignity of human life and its refusal to cooperate in the termination of innocent life. Once the institution's board has officially made and publicized it to all its publics, including the medical staff, we urge the institution to establish inservice education programs for all hospital personnel to explain its philos-

ophy regarding respect for life. Many member institutions have already taken or are about to take the steps outlined above. We urge all member institutions to do likewise.

Third, we urge all members to cooperate with local, state, and regional groups that are promoting respect for life.

Fourth, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a *Declaration on Abortion* at their meeting in Washington, DC, November 18. The Bishops' *Declaration*, which reaffirms their stand against abortion, has been publicized by the daily news media and will be published in full in the December issue of *HOSPITAL PROGRESS*. The strongly worded *Declaration* has drawn well-deserved attention and merits the support of CHA member institutions.

If you have any questions or suggestions concerning the above comments or the attached *Statement*, I would like very much to hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

SISTER MARY MAURITA, RSM,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION OF THE CATHOLIC HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION, APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, CINCINNATI, OHIO, JUNE 8, 1970

Whereas the Board of Trustees of The Catholic Hospital Association has adopted this day a Statement of Respect for Life, therefore,

Be it resolved, That the House of Delegates at its 55th Annual Convention recommit its membership to give witness to the dignity of human life. We are conscious that our membership faces grave problems in states where abortion is permitted. As an Association we will support and assist membership in protecting their right to refuse to cooperate in the termination of innocent life.

STATEMENT ON RESPECT FOR LIFE: THE CATHOLIC HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION

INTRODUCTION

The Catholic Hospital Association, with headquarters in St. Louis, Missouri, is a non-profit, national organization of nearly 900 Catholic sponsored hospitals, nursing homes, and related health care facilities located throughout the United States. Membership is voluntary.

We believe in God. We believe that He created man. We believe that man has an immortal soul and an eternal destiny both here on earth and beyond his life on earth. We believe that man transmits life. He does not create it. Our moral precepts with respect to abortion are founded on the Commandment: "Thou shalt not kill."

As an Association we have continually attempted to fulfill our responsibility to promote the dignity and worth of life, and to protect the right to life. Our individual and group efforts in the health care apostolate reflect this responsibility and concern for the person.

ABORTION AND THE RIGHT TO LIFE

The Catholic Hospital Association is greatly concerned with the growing general acceptance of abortion and the many attempts and successes of removing all prohibition of abortion from our legal system. The acceptance of abortion as a convenient way for a woman to terminate the life of her child has enormous implications. "The destruction of any human life is not a private matter but is the concern of every responsible citizen."¹ This belief, as stated by the Second Vatican Council, reads: "For God, the Lord of Life, has conferred on men the surpassing ministry of safeguarding life—a ministry which must be fulfilled in a manner which is worthy of man. Therefore from the moment

of conception life must be guarded with the greatest care. . . ."

The root issue upon which we take our stand against abortion is the existence of a defenseless human life. Its inviolability must be respected among civilized people. Abortion to prevent the birth of an unwanted child may seem to be humanitarian in particular situations, but it undermines the right to life. Historically, abandonment of reverence for human life in any form has resulted in the usurpation of authority over life with dire consequences for the human race. In this regard, the Second Vatican Council states: "Everyone should be persuaded that human life and the task of transmitting it are not realities bound up in this world alone. Hence, they cannot be measured or perceived only in terms of it, but always have a bearing on the eternal destiny of men."²

The God-given gifts to man of life itself and the transmission of life carry with them the moral obligation of reverence for human life, and a responsibility to protect the right to life, particularly the right to defenseless life.

All human life should be accorded a special protection under the law before, as well as after birth.

Therefore, in a spirit of ecumenical social involvement with those who share these convictions, with solicitude for the welfare of all mankind, and urged by the charity of Christ, the Catholic Hospital Association takes and will defend its stand on the right to life from the earliest stages of its development.

PROFESSIONAL UNIT CITES SPOKANITE

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of this House, an article entitled, "Professional Unit Cites Spokaneite," outlining the distinguished community service of Dr. Delbert F. Small, an eminent anesthesiologist, from Spokane.

Dr. Small's efforts in teaching and demonstrating mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and external heart massage is a credit to the medical profession and the inland empire community as well as to himself.

The article which follows appeared in the *Spokane Chronicle* of September 15, 1971:

PROFESSIONAL UNIT CITES SPOKANITE

Dr. Delbert F. Small, Spokane anesthesiologist, will receive the fourth Distinguished Service Award ever given by the Washington State Society of Anesthesiologists.

The award, a certificate and life membership in the Society, will be made Saturday night during the annual meeting of the Society in Ocean Shores.

The award is given partly in recognition of Dr. Small's extensive work in teaching and demonstrating mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and external heart massage. Dr. Richard L. Pokorny, Spokane anesthesiologist who submitted the nomination, said.

Dr. Small has given more than 250 demonstrations to service clubs, parent-teacher organizations, and professional groups.

¹ Vatican II Pastoral Constitution—The Church in the Modern World 51 p. 255.

² Vatican II Pastoral Constitution—The Church in the Modern World 51 p. 253.

He helped set up a teaching program with School District 81 that now is operated by district teachers.

Dr. Small, who began practicing medicine in Spokane in 1948, does the demonstration on a mouth-to-mouth resuscitation film made five years ago and distributed by the Spokane County Medical Society. The film has had such demand that three copies have been worn out and a fourth has been ordered.

Dr. Small was featured in a picture page demonstration of the first aid technique published by *The Chronicle* June 16, 1967, and reprinted several times for distribution.

Dr. Small holds a medical degree from the University of Kansas School of Medicine. He was made an honorary member of the Inland Empire Academy of General Practice in 1961, and is an honorary member of the North Spokane Rotary Club. Serving his second term on the board of trustees of the Spokane County Medical Society, he is former vice president of the State Society of Anesthesiologists.

THE DURFEE THEATER AND EDWARD LIDER

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the many residents of Fall River and its environs who through the years have enjoyed the often spectacular and frequently moving entertainment programs presented at the Durfee Theater in Fall River have noted with some nostalgia the announcement that the Durfee Theater is closing its doors.

This announcement was made known recently in a very poignant column in the *Fall River Herald*. As the final curtain falls and ends one memorable chapter in the history of Fall River theatrical and cultural life, thanks to Mr. Edward Lider, whose direction in recent years has made the Durfee Theater equal to its reputation, another chapter begins. Mr. Lider has announced that he is opening up twin theaters, both located in the downtown district of Fall River, which will carry on the traditions of the Durfee Theater.

In speaking of the cultural life of Fall River, and of the Durfee Theater, and its counterparts, it would be difficult not to focus upon the name and work of Edward Lider. He has for quite some time been a highly active and widely respected community and civic leader, and an enormous debt of appreciation is owed him for his many civic contributions to the well-being of Fall River and the general community. A native of New Bedford, and a graduate of Dartmouth College, and Harvard College, Mr. Lider has been associated with the Fall River Theater Corp. for 21 years, operating theaters in Fall River, Westport, Dartmouth, Somerset, Seekonk, Fairhaven, and in New Hampshire as well, all of which have benefited through his active involvement in social and community affairs, suggested by his direction of the Yarnian's Family Foundation, a charitable foundation. Mr. Lider has been most

¹ Statement on Abortion, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, April 22, 1970.

active in the Belmont Country Club, and, an avid sports enthusiast, he enjoys tennis and golf, when time is available from his civic preoccupations. He is a member of the board of governors of the Theater Owners of New England, and president of the Head Agents Alumni Fund of Dartmouth. He also serves on the president's council of Brandeis University.

The many fine and worthwhile endeavors which he has encouraged and in which he has participated reflect the greatest of credit upon him.

The article from the Fall River Herald follows:

THE DUFFEE THEATER AND EDWARD LIDER

It began 42 years ago with the Marx Brothers comedy, "The Coconut." And Tuesday night, the long association of Nathan Yamins Enterprises Inc. with the Duffee Theatre, ends.

Edward Lider made the announcement today. He said the lease will not be renewed. It's a matter of economics and a trend that has produced the closing of many of the country's big movie palaces.

The building is owned by the William Duffee estate. Mayor Mitchell said he had talked to him about the city's acquisition of the property for use as a municipal auditorium.

This was the latest overture. Before that, said the mayor, the discussion centered on use of the Duffee Theatre site and its subdivision within the block, as the location for the new city hall.

"That would have involved purchase and relocation of tenants," the mayor said, "and we dropped it."

Mrs. William Thurber of Barrington, spokesman for the estate, said efforts will be made to rent the theatre. She said she regrets Lider's decision not to renew the lease, in view of the long association that Nathan Yamins Enterprises Inc. had with the Duffee family.

A new heating and air conditioning system is needed at the Duffee, along with extensive renovations.

Lider said that from his standpoint, it would not be a practical investment. "In the first place," he explained, "we were only tenants. And we have to be realistic, too. The day of the big movie house is over. The majestic and Loew's State have closed in Providence. It's the same almost everywhere. The trend is to build and operate smaller auditoriums—the cinema concept."

He has expansion plans for the Center Cinema, wholly owned by the Yamins chain. He said he hopes to develop it into a four cinema complex. Lider said the project would be timed for incorporation in the central business district redevelopment program.

John J. McAvoy and Miss Maureen Harrington, who have run the Duffee Theatre operation for Lider, will go to the Center, both with higher executive responsibilities.

Lider said McAvoy will be a vice president in the corporate structure, in charge of promotion and public and community relations.

Center Cinema facilities will be available for community agency use, just as the Duffee Theatre.

The Duffee, in addition to being a movie house, was also used for school graduations and other civic programs.

The Duffee opened with a gala premiere of "The Coconut" on Aug. 31, 1929. At that time it was considered the showpiece of New England movie houses, with 2,300 seats, making it one of the largest in the region.

Its grand foyer was designed in a Moorish motif, reproducing in detail part of the Alhambra Palace in Spain.

In addition to the Marx Brothers movie, opening night also had a stage show, a military review by Shayne's Cadets.

One of the highlights of a Duffee movie program was the organ concert preceding it.

In 1963, Lider inaugurated a live show policy, too, bringing touring companies of Broadway shows to Fall River, along with concert attractions.

Overall, 36 of these shows were presented. The first was "The Sound of Music," and the last production, offered last spring, was "1776."

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Doug Shaw, representing the Blue Cross/Blue Shield organization discussed the drawbacks of only adding more money to the health system without a commitment to improve services and redistribute them. He testified at the hearings I recently held in Minneapolis. He maintains that the programs under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are uncoordinated and the result is a duplication of services focusing on different age groups.

As a means to improve the system, Blue Cross is engaged in an experimental project which contracts out health care to different facilities, a hospital or a clinic, for example. This experimental program may have important results and should be carefully watched as movements are made to reform our health care system.

Mr. Douglas M. Person and his wife were able to attend the hearings in Minneapolis and provided the following letter setting forth their views in some detail. Since Mr. Person's letter bears directly on a concern of Mr. Shaw's, I am enclosing it at this point. I commend the very articulate statement of Mr. Person to all of my colleagues:

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
March 1, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
United States House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: My wife and I were privileged to sit in the audience at your health hearings at the Minneapolis Public Library on February 26 and 27, 1971.

You are to be commended for arranging such a session for persons to air their concerns about the health system in the United States. There is an ever-increasing need for meaningful dialogue between citizens and their elected officials.

As a professional health researcher I am deeply concerned about health of all citizens. There is a strong need to maintain a degree of pluralism in the health system combining the best of both the public and private sectors. In addition, the Health Maintenance Strategy holds considerable promise for effecting long-needed changes in the health system.

I know only too well the enormous tax burden middle income persons bear. I can not urge you strongly enough to seek to develop a health care delivery system which places major emphasis on top quality health care at the lowest possible cost. I think that HMO's are surely a significant step in that direction.

The Blue Cross and Blue Shield organizations have demonstrated administrative expertise and I would encourage you and other Congressmen and Senators to include them in the administration of any national health plans which are enacted.

I would encourage you to consider the publication of the testimony provided at your health hearings. I think many persons could benefit from reading, at their leisure, the various points of view presented. If you do have the proceedings published, I would very much appreciate a copy.

Best wishes to you in your efforts to restructure the health system and in your many other activities in the United States House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS M. PERSON.

A MESSAGE WORTH PROCLAIMING

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues an exceptional address by the Reverend Harold W. Kaser, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Saginaw, Mich. I do so primarily because I feel it is a special message from one who serves in an exalted position and it carries meaning to those of us who also serve. I would also mention that it was Reverend Kaser's first sermon at First Presbyterian Church, which has been my home parish for over 20 years. It was my privilege at one time to serve as a church trustee there.

Based on his first sermon, I would judge that First Presbyterian Church is in excellent hands as it meets the challenging future. Reverend Kaser, who first accepted the call to First Presbyterian last May, was ordained July 6, 1944, and served three Presbyterian churches in Pennsylvania before a 16-year stop at Coshocton, Ohio, Presbyterian Church. A native of Ohio, Reverend Kaser is a graduate of Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio, and was graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J. He and his wife Winogene have four children, three of whom are married and one in college.

Reverend Kaser's sermon, entitled "Proclaiming the Testimony of God," follows:

"PROCLAIMING THE TESTIMONY OF GOD"
I CORINTHIANS 2:1-5

Ever since Sunday, May 23, when I walked into this sanctuary to accept the call to be your pastor (and almost fell down the steps as I entered), I have been wondering what I would say to you on this first Sunday in the pulpit. When one is called to be the pastor of some 2,000 people, he ought to tremble. I tremble, not because God is too small, not because the Christian faith is of no significance, but I tremble because of the frailty of this human vessel.

When it comes to being human, the pastor is no exception to the rule. He often finds his bread very soggy, and his stairs very steep. And I want you to know from the beginning that at least this pastor's feet are made of clay.

When I ascended the steps to this platform

this morning I reminded myself that this pulpit was once dedicated to the preaching of Good News—the Good News about God and Man. I assure you it shall remain that way as long as I am here. I also reminded myself that this pulpit has been hallowed by consecrated men of the ministry who have stood here long before my time. When I think of all that this church means to you and your families, and all that the Holy Spirit has done here, I can only say with the Apostle Paul, "Who is sufficient for this?"

And yet, in the providence of God, it is now my time to stand here and to preach the gospel. I do not expect to preach it in clever words of human wisdom, but I earnestly pray that I may preach it with sincerity and conviction. So I say, such as I have I give to you.

I cannot begin my ministry here without paying tribute to my predecessors who have laid the foundation upon which we may now build. My prayer is, not that today, or even in a year, I will be able to accomplish all they did, but as the years go by, you will give me a place in your heart also.

I have never felt it proper to preach a sermon without a text. My text this morning is from Paul's letter to the church in Corinth, where he reminded them of the purpose of his coming to them. These are his words:

"When I came to you, brethren, I did not come proclaiming to you the testimony of God in lofty words of wisdom. But I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified." (I Corinthians 2:1-2)

Paul had a way of getting straight to the heart of the gospel. The testimony of God is that Jesus Christ was crucified for our sins, and that he rose again for our salvation. This is the good news that we are asked to receive. It is not necessary that it be preached in lofty words of human wisdom, but that we speak it and live it from a convinced mind and a committed heart.

There are three things about this text I wish to discuss, and in discussing them give you some idea of my hopes and plans as we work together in this church.

First, let me say something about the message, "For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified." For 2,000 years the church has given to the world the message and the life of Jesus Christ, who has been described as "the fairest among ten thousand, the bright and morning star." The message began in the midst of unusual circumstances, for when Jesus came there was no fanfare of trumpets, no waving of flags, no big parade, and then someone announcing, "enter the king." When Jesus began his ministry he announced it in these words:

"To preach good news to the poor . . . to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." (Luke 4:18-19)

The world of that time was not used to that kind of message. It knew the tramping feet of the Roman legions, the power of the ancient Caesars, the cruelty of Herod the Great, and the prestige of ancient Tyre and Sidon. Yet, after almost 2,000 years, the Roman legions are now buried in the dust, Caesar and Herod are remembered only in history, Tyre and Sidon are places where fishermen dry their nets.

On the other hand, the good news about Jesus Christ continues to thrill us so that our heart leaps up and our feet want to march for God. It is true, as Jesus said, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself." So it is that this Jesus Christ comes to us in our time. Peter Marshall used to say that he comes "like a tap on the shoulder, or like a tug on the coat sleeve." Indeed, our hearts are restless until they rest in him.

There is a significant passage in Luke, Chapter 3, which reads:

"In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea and Herod being Tetrarch of Galilee . . . Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John . . . in the wilderness . . . and he went out preaching repentance and faith."

I want to update that passage to read as follows:

"In the third year of Richard Nixon's presidency, when Milliken was governor of Michigan, and Chou-En-Lai was premier of China, at the time of the wage and price freeze, when the legislature was considering a change in the tax structure for the support of public education, and while we were making an agreement regarding Berlin, the word of God came to a congregation of people in Saginaw, Michigan, and they went out preaching repentance and faith."

Such is the gospel which comes to us in this time and in this place. Now, as far as my preaching this gospel is concerned, I have never felt it my privilege to preach anything from the pulpit which I did not first of all believe myself. Nothing I say will be said simply because I have an axe to grind. I shall never ask anyone to do anything which I am not willing to do myself. If, what I say from this pulpit seems costly at times, it is because our Lord himself paid a considerable price. Salvation is free, but it is never cheap. So, I say again, in the words of Paul, "I come, having decided to know nothing except Jesus Christ, and him crucified."

Second, Paul not only had a message, he also had a method. "I was with you in fear and much trembling and my speech and preaching was not with enticing words of human wisdom." If Paul had to say that, what else is there for me to say? Paul, who reasoned with the philosophers on Mar's Hill; Paul, who stood before King Agrippa and accused him of sin and asked him to repent; Paul, who was the great missionary of all times; Paul, who could write, "now abideth faith, hope and love, but the greatest of these is love."

That Paul reminded the Corinthians that his preaching was not human wisdom. I remind you that my preaching will not win oratorical contests, nor will it contain the wisdom of all the ages; I hope, however, it will not be dull and plodding. I can only ask that you allow me to interpret the Word of God as the Spirit reveals it to me.

I shall never ask or expect that you agree with everything I say. I am not "Sir Oracle, and all other dogs must keep silent." I do ask that you share with me in the privilege of baptizing and instructing your children and young people, of counselling those who are seeking a Christian solution to their problems, and of bringing comfort to those who mourn.

I want you to know that I seek God's guidance and strength for my work. Gladstone once said, "It is the business of every statesman to find out which way God is moving for the next fifty years, and then seek to follow him." I shall always try to find out which way God is wanting to move in this community, and then endeavor to guide this church in that direction. And because no one can do everything himself, I shall always welcome the help and support of every person in this congregation. Everyone here has a contribution to make and each contribution will be important. Nor is it my policy to cater to special groups of people. The ground is level at the foot of the cross. And I shall consider everyone of equal importance.

Finally, let me say something about the people. Paul said that all of what he did was done to the end that the people's faith would not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. That is the only way a strong church can be built. I have not the least desire to build a church around myself. That

would only invite failure. I have every intention to do all I can to help you build your faith in the power of God. "He is our refuge and strength, a very present help in time of trouble."

In conclusion, I want you to know that I consider it an opportunity and a privilege to be your pastor. I thank you for the opportunity and assure you that I shall not abuse the privilege. I appreciate the warmth with which you have received us, the eagerness you have shown already in wanting to be the church of Jesus Christ, and I pray God's blessings upon all of us in our labors of love.

Praise be to God. Amen.

PARLIAMENT AND LIBERTY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Interparliamentary Union Conference in Paris, France, which I had the opportunity to attend as a member of the United States delegation, a thought-provoking and meaningful editorial appeared on page 1 of the French newspaper, *Le Monde*. The article is entitled "Parliaments and Liberty" and calls appropriate attention to the distinction between the parliamentary bodies in our western free world societies and those which are elected in the communist oriented nations as well as in some of the underdeveloped countries.

In addition, the editorial notes the significance of the IPU and the opportunities for useful communication which this organization provides. I am pleased to attach a translation of the article from the September 4, 1971 issue of *Le Monde*:

PARLIAMENTS AND LIBERTY

Is it really the rule of Parliaments in the world today to "defend liberty", to "react to the excesses of technocracy", and to function as "a bulwark against the inevitable tendency of the Executive power to yield to the convenience of uncontrolled authority," as Mr. Pompidou said in Versailles on Thursday before the fifty-ninth conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union? One can only applaud these purposes, but it is very necessary to note that actually the facts differ greatly from these noble ambitions and that the only thing that the seven hundred parliamentarians, who met in Paris for the purposes of this conference, have in common is that they are the guests of the French Government.

How, indeed, can we compare the role of a parliamentarian in France and in Ethiopia, in Belgium and in Spain, in the USSR and in Israel, in the United States and in Kuwait, in Denmark and in the Philippines—all States that are full members with the Inter-Parliamentary Union very few of whom can pass for models of democracy? Quite recently Morocco, which can hardly aspire to this title, was admitted to membership in the organization, while President Thieu's veto at the departure of certain Opposition parliamentarians for Paris once again attracted attention to the election manipulations in South Vietnam. It is further necessary, to note that most of the sessions of the Union begin by discussions on subjects far removed from this contribution to the "development of democratic institutions" that was stated first and foremost in the statutes of this organization.

The multiplication of these "anomalies", precisely, has led to those running the Union to tone down the point that is far too greatly contradicted by the facts. The draft presented at this session reforming the statutes calls for elimination from Article One of the word "democratic" and its replacement by "representative" institutions. The fact that one of the delegations that opposed this charge is that of . . . South Korea proves, if need be, that everything is relative as regards democracy. As, moreover, no one up to the best informed has suggested a better recipe for setting up "representative" institutions than free elections, one does not see where change that has been contributed will diminish the fundamental hypocrisy on which the entire edifice rests.

It is true that the countries in which a genuine parliamentary democracy functions are no more than an island in the developed area of the planet. The problems of the Third World, experience has shown, certainly have not found all their solutions in authoritarian regimes, nor has democracy à la Western succeeded.

Would it be necessary then to eliminate from the Union, by a rigorous definition of the role of the parliaments, all the countries with a doubtful regime, and to accentuate even more the gap between industrialized nations and underdeveloped countries? The organization permits useful contacts among parliamentarians of all continents. Without displaying undue optimism, one cannot refuse to admit that these exchanges may encourage some of them to show themselves more active in their own country and to favor there, were it only indirectly, the respect for or the development of liberties.

Finally, these sessions generally afford an opportunity, if not for resolving the world problems—the U.N. itself cannot do much there—at least for enlightening the parliamentarians on aspects that generally escape them in the always limited and often passionate setting of local assemblies. Thereby, these debates are not entirely useless to the mission of "peace and cooperation among the peoples" that also the Inter-Parliamentary Union has assigned to itself.—Translated by Elizabeth Price.

PUTTING THE FOX IN CHARGE OF THE CHICKEN COOP

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when millions of consumers are in desperate need of better representation at the Federal level, President Nixon has moved in the opposite direction and established an 80-member businessman's "Council for Consumer Affairs."

The Council will not only allow businessmen to gain firsthand information on consumer policies and activities which would be advantageous to the business interest, but the creation of the Council is an obvious misallocation of priorities in the utilization of valuable administrative energy.

If President Nixon was truly aligned with the consumer interest, the administrative energy would have been channeled toward consumer representation, not business representation.

My bill to create a strong independent Consumer Protection Agency, H.R. 14,

and similar measures are opposed by the President. He apparently would rather have consumer opponents determine consumer needs, than permit consumers themselves to have any meaningful representation. The President's approach is something akin to putting the fox in charge of the chicken coop.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point, an article from Consumer Federation of America News, which appeared in Co-op Consumer recently:

CONSUMER FEDERATION BLASTS NIXON'S NEW "BUSINESS COUNCIL"

The Consumer Federation of America has taken a strong position in opposition to President Nixon's recently established 80-member businessmen's "Council for Consumer Affairs."

This action—by executive order—must be challenged. In doing so, it is time to seriously and publicly question the President's promise and blueprint for "bringing us together."

In setting up the "National Business Council for Consumer Affairs," the President has elevated the status and influence of business on government far beyond the present pinnacle already enjoyed by this top-level vested interest.

Although we often suspect business and industry control government, we are certainly not alone in charging that business is the dominate power in government decision-making, whether it be in the U.S. Food & Drug Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, the U.S. Agriculture Department, or any of the other numerous regulatory agencies whose job is to enforce and regulate in the public interest.

Congressional investigations reveal that business and industry already dominate the federal system of advisory groups involving 1800 committees, 20,000 members, 4400 staff people at an annual minimum \$75-million cost to the taxpayers.

Not only do business representatives run committees and advise ranking federal officials, industry attorneys line up like fleets of Cadillacs to lobby Congress to defeat or dilute beyond meaning all consumer protection legislation. They appear daily in opposition to effective government regulation and enforcement. And business already has its own chief protection agent at the right hand of President Nixon in the person (with full U.S. department and budget) of Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans.

Do consumers have a champion in the federal establishment? Does anyone in government speak for the consuming public? No, but we do have legislation in the hopper to provide us with a strong consumer advocate. We need the independent consumer protection agency now!

Back to the President's newest council.

President Nixon seems to be saying business should get an even better deal. The biggest businesses of all will advise him on federal, state and local consumer issues. As we see it, in order to advise, they will have an unprecedented inside track on information, policies, and actions which can be turned to their own self-interest.

Actually, the President's new strategy to assure "equity in the marketplace", as he puts it, is as consistent and insensitive to consumer needs as his opposition to our legislative priorities. He does not want an independent consumer protection agency, for example, with a consumer advocate representing the public in government operations. President Nixon opposes establishment of an independent product safety commission to assure that safe goods are on the marketplace. In both instances, President Nixon says in effect that if Congress insists on setting up these new functions, they should not have independent status. He proposes

burying them in existing agencies that have either failed or been unable to do an effective job for consumers.

The President opposes federal auto insurance reform. He says, "let the states do it if it must be done." He's fighting us on setting up a better health care system. He opposes consumer class action without a Justice Department "trigger." The list mounts.

It is impossible to understand the President's action. Is he simply blind to the public's interest? Is he attempting to inject so much more business influence in the federal government that consumers will be stripped of even present inadequate defenses? Is he really setting up an impenetrable lobby to kill consumer protection legislation in Congress?

If this Council fulfills the functions set out by the President, every time CFA appears before a congressional committee or government agency to represent you, business will appear to present an alternative proposal—more, it will say, in the public interest.

It is imperative that this cavalier treatment of consumers be repudiated decisively. One way is to insist that an independent consumer protection agency be established.

ELECTION FOR SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there had been an election scheduled for this Sunday in South Vietnam. However, for all practical purposes, that election has been called off because there is but one candidate for the presidency, the incumbent. The best description for this forthcoming nonevent would be to call it a "nonelection."

The incumbent has eliminated his two potential opponents, but has agreed to resign if he does not get 50 percent of the vote only after severe pressure from the United States and his own legislature. That concession is just a facade, as one of the eliminated opponents, Gen. Duong Van Minh, pointed out:

President Thieu has written the electoral law. Now he will organize the election. He prints the voting cards and the ballots. He has the keys to the ballot boxes. He will count the votes. He will draw up the returns. He will proclaim the results. He can decide beforehand how many per cent of the votes he wishes to have, and he can rectify the figures to match 50 per cent or any other percentages he wishes to have. That is a joke, a very big joke.

The U.S. Government has taken a rather curious position throughout all of this. We have always proclaimed our concern that the people should have the opportunity to determine who will govern them. That opportunity has been sabotaged—not by the Vietcong—but by the President of South Vietnam.

In the face of this impending political hoax, the administration has heroically defended its attitude of "neutrality" in the election. Unfortunately, "neutrality" in this case has amounted to a tacit approval of the corruption and the heavy-handed rule of the Thieu gov-

ernment in Saigon. South Vietnam somehow has strayed far from the principles of democracy that the American presence there was supposed to guarantee.

At the very least, this country should force the government in South Vietnam to postpone the election. The National Assembly in Saigon already has recommended that, even though President Thieu has said he is determined to hold the "election." The nonelection episode is but another piece of evidence that this country's involvement in Southeast Asia has been a failure, a very disastrous failure. The United States should admit that and set a date for withdrawal so that this dismal chapter in American history might be ended without more lives being lost.

There should be no doubt by now that the great majority of people in this country favor a speedy withdrawal. Any number of national polls have indicated so, not to mention the volume of antiwar

mail that my colleagues and I receive each day.

A Chicago group, called Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, now has added to the weight of that evidence. For its survey, the organization picked precincts that had voted for the President and the incumbent Congressmen in the last election. The results of the survey indicate a change in voter attitude—in favor of ending the war this year.

I think that the Members of Congress might find the results of the poll interesting, and I am submitting those results with a letter of explanation from the project director of Business Executives Move for Peace in Vietnam.

The articles follow:

BEM—BUSINESS EXECUTIVE MOVE FOR VIETNAM PEACE

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are writing to report to you the results of a BEM-sponsored survey just completed in supposedly

hawkish precincts in the Chicago metropolitan area on voter attitudes toward a firm 1971 troop withdrawal date in Vietnam. The survey shows that 72.7% of voters in precincts President Nixon carried in 1968 will vote against the President and their congressman unless those officials move to withdraw "all U.S. military personnel . . . out of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia by December 31, 1971."

BEM canvassers worked in districts represented by congressmen who voted against the Nedzi-Whalen Amendment. The canvassing method was to work house to house in precincts selected because they voted for the President and the incumbent congressman at the last elections. All canvassers were volunteers; all also are residents of the districts they worked. No professional politicians of either party took part.

The canvassing took place during July and August. A total of 3804 voters in six congressional districts marked ballots, with 2765 (72.7%) marking for the Dec. 31st deadline and 1039 (27.3%) voting approval of the President's current policy.

Following are the district results:

District No.	Congressman	Incumbent's percentage				
		Districtwide vote, 1970	1970 vote in percents worked for survey	BEM survey 1971	Survey percent against Congressman	Size of sample
5	John Kluczynski (Democrat)	68.8	62.3	17.4	82.6	1,143
	(Nixon vote in 1968) (statewide)	51.6	52.5	17.4	82.6	1,143
10	Harold Collier (Republican)	62.2	68.0	35.7	64.3	160
12	Robert McClory (Republican)	62.1	66.8	33.5	66.5	562
13	Philip Crane (Republican)	58.0	51.8	26.9	73.1	936
14	John M. Erlenborn (Republican)	65.5	70.5	37.3	62.7	268
15	Mrs. Charlotte Reid (Republican)	68.9	77.0	28.8	71.2	285

5TH DISTRICT

Basically a Chicago district, the 5th stretches out the southwest side south of the Sanitary & Ship Canal to bedroom-factory suburbs like Stickney and Justice. The district includes the old Stock Yards, Midway Airport and Mayor Daley's home. Our workers canvassed in eight precincts, one in the 14th Ward (a Democratic stronghold), two in the 15th (Gage Park), four in the 23rd (Garfield Ridge), and one in the town of Burbank. Both President Nixon (in 1968) and Rep. Kluczynski (in 1970) carried all eight precincts; there was also a substantial vote for Gov. Wallace in these precincts. Those sampled in the 25th precinct of the 15th Ward, three blocks from Congressman Kluczynski's home, voted 156-12 for the Nedzi-Whalen date.

10TH DISTRICT

West Cook County suburbs. It ranges geographically from Des Plaines and Park Ridge on the north to LaGrange Park at the southern border. Our workers canvassed in Oak Park (three precincts), River Forest (one), Park Ridge (one), Maywood (two), Brookfield (one), Bellwood (one) and LaGrange Park (one). All 10 precincts were carried both by President Nixon and Rep. Collier. Proviso Township, Pct 23 (LaGrange Park), closest to Rep. Collier's home, showed a 55-50 majority for Nedzi-Whalen.

12TH DISTRICT

Lake and McHenry counties, and two northwest Cook county townships. It includes suburbs, exurban towns, and farms. Our six precincts are split between Lake County (Lake Forest, Libertyville, and Deerfield) and McHenry County (two in Crystal Lake and one, partly rural, in McHenry). All six precincts were carried both by President Nixon and Rep. McClory. Shields Township, Pct 9, in Lake Forest, closest to Rep. McClory's home, showed a 140-32 majority for Nedzi-Whalen.

13TH DISTRICT

North Cook County suburbs, from the Lake west to Schaumburg. Our workers canvassed

in 15 precincts: Wheeling (One), Northfield (one), Elk Grove Village (one), Glenview (one), Evanston (four), Morton Grove (two), Lincolnwood (one), and Skokie (one); and three in "Evanston P.O." precincts; 12 of the 15 were carried by Rep. Crane, and all were carried by President Nixon. In Precinct 4 of Elk Grove Village, Congressman Crane's home town, the sampling was 71-34 in favor of Nedzi-Whalen.

14TH DISTRICT

DuPage County (far western suburbs) and the Joliet panhandle of Will County. Our workers canvassed in six precincts, excluding Will County, which was carried in 1970 by Rep. Erlenborn's Democratic opponent. Work was done in Wheaton (one), Elmhurst (one), Villa Park (two, including the new Brandywine subdivision), and Lombard (two). All six precincts were carried both by President Nixon and Rep. Erlenborn. Pct. 85, York Township, in Elmhurst where Congressman Erlenborn lives, turned out 44-25 for Nedzi-Whalen.

15TH DISTRICT

Kane, DeKalb, Kendall, Grundy and LaSalle counties, including exurban cities, downstate towns, a huge state university and farm country. Our workers canvassed in two precincts: Geneva and rural Blackberry Township of Kane County. Both were carried by Rep. Reid and President Nixon. We also included some ballots signed at the Kane County fair last month.

DON'T CONFUSE ME WITH THE FACTS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, human nature being what it is, I suppose we must expect another celebration of

"Earth Day" again next year, but I would have thought that by now this particular fad might also have gone the way of the narrow tie.

If the "Environmental Holiday rites" are held, it appears highly probable that Professor Keith Frye of the Department of Geophysical Sciences at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Va., will not be invited to participate.

Although he was not invited last year he has probably sealed his fate for certain now, eliminating any slim chance he might have had by sharing his thoughts on environmentalism with the world through yesterday's issue of the National Observer. However, I don't think he will lose any sleep over it.

His article, entitled "Don't Confuse Me With the Facts—A Teacher's Sad Tale of Ecology Activists," relates a series of experiences with the ecology movement that I'm sure have been suffered by others as well as Mr. Frye.

Two paragraphs in his essay especially caught my attention, because I think they really sum up the problem very succinctly:

The environment has become—to some—a personal as well as a popular crusade, but, unfortunately, too much emphasis is placed on the crusade and too little on the environment. Unfortunately, because when ignorant zeal is the major weapon turned against ignorant indifference, not much progress can be expected.

The defense frequently offered for environmentalists, especially for youthful environmentalists, is that they are sincere and well-meaning individuals who see something wrong with the world and are intent on doing something about it. The same excuse could be offered for the Spanish Inquisitors, but, at least, they knew their theology.

Mr. Speaker, the energy and enthusiasm of our young people constitute a powerful social force which can be tremendously constructive or destructive depending on its direction. I think Mr. Frye's observations clearly underscore the need for redirection of this energy into more substantive examination of our environmental problems—toward more research and less rhetoric.

It's true that mobilization of public opinion is an important factor, but this in itself will accomplish little. As Mr. Frye points out, work, not student hurrah is needed to develop the sophisticated environmental sciences necessary to harmoniously accommodate our industrialized civilization to our environment.

I believe all my colleagues in the House will be interested in the following article:

[From The National Observer (Ill.),
Oct. 2, 1971]

**DON'T CONFUSE ME WITH THE FACTS—A
TEACHER'S SAD TALE OF ECOLOGY ACTIVISTS**
(By Keith Frye)

The average environmentalist knows as much about environmental science as the average Jesus freak knows about theology. And both prefer to keep their ignorance.

I have reached this discouraging conclusion after three years of trying to teach a university undergraduate course on environmental science.

The environment has become—to some—a personal as well as a popular crusade, but, unfortunately, too much emphasis is placed on the crusade and too little on the environment. Unfortunately, because when ignorant zeal is the major weapon turned against ignorant indifference, not much progress can be expected.

BACKED BY CHAIRMAN

Although I have always been interested in my personal environment, it was not until the fall of 1968 that it became apparent to me that environment might become a national issue and a national cause. I then took note of the fact that the sciences dealing with our environments were, and still are, highly fragmented and scattered through many university departments. My response to this observation was to draw up an outline for a course that would survey the various parts of science that pertain to our habitat on the earth, and would show the interrelationships of the world system. Since I had the active assistance of my department chairman, the dean of sciences and the provost soon were convinced of the need for this new course.

The student response to the course, first offered in the fall of 1969, was dismal. Out of a total student body of around 8,000, only 7 signed up for instruction about the environment that semester. In subsequent years, I ended up with fewer than 10 students each time the course was presented. I offered the course in summer school, and it was canceled for lack of interest.

NOT "IN"

Even if I were the worst public speaker teaching at the university, the worst organized lecturer, and the professor believed by the students to be the least fair in distribution for grades, only lack of interest in the subject matter of the course could account for this state of affairs.

I do not believe that I am the worst or the least—but environmental science is a science course, and science does not seem to be in this year. The response of the concerned student appears to be, "My mind is made up, do not confuse me with facts."

Of the students who have passed through my course on environmental science, the

most attentive were the ones who wanted to know what all this environmental hullabaloo was about, while the class cutters and assignment shirkers were those supposedly committed to doing something about the state of the world. The "committed" students seemed determined to wallow vicariously in the sins of their elders; what they wanted was vivid description of environmental degradation committed by our species. They lost interest when horror stories were not forthcoming.

RAISED HANDS—BRIEFLY

I asked one of my classes how many of its members would be interested in obtaining a degree in environmental science; two students raised their hands. When I began to list the courses that would be required, those two hands quickly dropped.

Every college or university staff has its legions of environmental experts, but I was soon read out of that not-so-select campus group. My offense, it appears, was that I did not have the correct attitude, did not adhere to the proper line.

During a symposium on pollution problems, at which I was asked to deliver a prepared lecture, I had the temerity to suggest that most of our environmental ills result from lack of planning. I suggested that good, county-wide management of land usage could result from planning based upon adequate geologic studies of the nature of the area in question and of its underlying bedrock. I cited examples from New York, from Michigan, from Illinois, and from California where this had been done successfully. To me, this was exciting; some people were doing the right environmental things. The audience reaction was stony.

POPULAR HORROR

Another speaker was a big hit with a talk about population problems in South America, India, and China, and about his vasectomy. Dire predictions of horrific results, to be anticipated because of rampant population growth in remote and impoverished parts of the world, are always popular. But how can American citizens control the population explosions in those places with anything short of the bomb?

On another occasion I sat on a panel, in company with two oceanographers, to discuss natural resources and their exhaustion. We discussed what natural resources are, which ones we have in abundance (iron and coal), which ones are already in critically short supply (silver and mercury), and what the economic and technical response has been to those in short supply (substitutions). During the question-and-answer period, one young woman repeatedly and somewhat hysterically demanded to know how we could talk like that, so calmly when the Atlantic Ocean was polluted.

After the discussion, a very studious looking young man approached me and asked when I expected doomsday to come. I was startled, but he patiently explained that he wanted to know the date of the end of the world so that he could plan for it. He did not seem to think much of a scientist who could not give him the date of an event that he was certain would terminate his life.

LECTURES AND HARD ROCK

In April 1970, my university joined with the rest of the schools in the country to celebrate Earth Day. We had displays, movies, poetry sessions, lectures, and hard-rock music—the lectures alternating with the hard-rock music in the same hall. The hirsute lovers of hard rock fled the lectures and a group of concerned older citizens fled the music as best they could. The older audience bombarded me with questions far more perceptive than any I had been asked by my students.

The talk I gave at our first Earth Day celebration suggested how a modern, industrial-

ized civilization might integrate itself comfortably with the natural world. I was not invited to have any part in the Earth Day celebration for 1971. Since I do not have any pet theory on how and when the world will end, I do not have the attitude proper to a speaker chosen to make a return appearance at the Environmental Holiday rites. Anyone, any scientist, who does not talk glibly about impending catastrophes to the human species does not appear to be showing the proper sincerity about the environment.

Harmoniously accommodating our highly industrialized civilization to the outside world will be an engineering feat worthy of the name *Homo sapiens*. And more than exhortation will be needed to make accommodation genuinely harmonious. The environmental sciences have not yet developed adequate sophistication to lay the foundations for comprehensive environmental engineering. Work, not student hurrah is needed to acquire full comprehension of how the world system operates and how we might best fit into it.

The defense frequently offered for environmentalists, especially for youthful environmentalists, is that they are sincere and well-meaning individuals who see something wrong with the world and are intent on doing something about it. The same excuse could be offered for the Spanish Inquisitors, but, at least, they knew their theology.

THOSE THAT HAVE TO POLLUTE TO SURVIVE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, if 1970 was the "Year of Environmental Awareness," and 1971 the "Year of Environmental Action," 1972 is already promising to be the year of environmental procrastination. Now that environmental problems have been more or less defined, and an institutional framework for solving these problems has been created, we are approaching a period when concerted action and measurable results are in order. Nobody likes hard work, but that is what it will take to suppress environmental contaminants; and most of us especially dislike hard and expensive work.

The Council on Environmental Quality has cautiously estimated that it will cost \$105 billion to carry on an effective anti-pollution program through 1975. Even when officials boast of a \$1 trillion gross national product, the sum \$105 billion gives a jolt, and causes one to stop, and ponder and begin to rationalize.

The question for 1972 is, how much rationalization can be tolerated, and how long should it continue. How long a time should be spent discussing the cost-benefit ratio of environmental protection, the effects of antipollution expenditures on the economy, or on jobs, or on whatever other variable is thrown into the discussion?

Answers do not come easily, but perhaps such thoughtful articles as the recent analysis by Richard J. Cattani of the Christian Science Monitor can help spare us a too-leisurely debate. His conclusions are direct and the priorities he sets contend with most of the points

which could be argued. If it is evident, as Mr. Cattani states, that sound environmental policy is also sound economic policy, we may not need to launch into a full-scale exposition of economic variables. And, if it is accepted that those who have to pollute to survive should simply find another line of work, then pollution abatement programs can proceed effectively in an environmentally oriented free-enterprise system.

I am happy to bring Mr. Cattani's article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

ROAR-AHEAD RUCKELSHAUS AND WAIT-A-MINUTE STANS

(By Richard J. Cattani)

One trusts President Nixon appreciates the political capital he laid up for himself in appointing William Ruckelshaus to run the Environmental Protection Agency last fall.

Bill Ruckelshaus might be embarrassed by all the nice things people in Washington are saying about him: even veteran Democrats and environmental visionaries in Congress like Rep. John Dingell of Michigan ("He seems to be the classical honest man who doesn't need to fear anyone because he does what he thinks is right") and Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin ("Ruckelshaus has been doing remarkably well"). Outside of government, environmentalists say Ruckelshaus has "guts and savvy."

This approval is based on such actions as the stiff air quality standards his agency put out in April, and his ultimatum to Atlanta, Cleveland, and Detroit to stop polluting nearby waters with inadequately treated sewage. This Ruckelshaus activist image redounds to the credit of the man who appointed him, Mr. Nixon.

But praise isn't given out without a price in Washington. And in the case of Mr. Ruckelshaus, there are riders on the plaudits which imply reservations about the administration's environmental intentions.

Some environmentalists are convinced that shop-running is not one of Mr. Ruckelshaus' long suits, as it is of, say, an Elliot Richardson at Health, Education, and Welfare. The EPA has 6,000 employees. It has been moved about several times and has not yet settled in its own home. Even when it does later this summer, it is not expected quickly to become efficient. It was put together by taking people from other departments and agencies who are trained along the lines of the sectarian thinking of where they came from. Outsiders are not impressed with many of the second-line EPA management men.

But the biggest worry of environmentalists is that the White House deck is stacked against Mr. Ruckelshaus, that between him and the President are a thicket of Cabinet and staff men whose instincts are chiefly protective of the polluter, not the polluted on—that, in effect, "economics" may be gaining the day against effective environmental action.

The case for moderating the government's environmental effort is a plausible one. The country is coming out of a recession. The rate of economic recovery has been disappointingly slow. Inflation continues. Unemployment is high—and expected to stay high up to the November, 1972, elections. And while the polls show that, Vietnam aside, the environment is a number two issue, the economy is still number one.

Thus when the automakers say pollution abatement equipment, at \$300 a car, for 10 million units a year will cost consumers \$3 billion, an administration attuned to rising prices could be expected to turn an attentive ear. Or if an industry says it will have to shut down plants because abatement orders would make operations unprofitable, an ad-

ministration worried about jobs might be expected to look twice.

But it's a fallacy that, on balance, sound environmental policy is not also sound economic policy. It is.

There is a decisive economic advantage in ending pollution. The Council on Environmental Quality, for instance, says the cost of air pollution in terms of the GNP can be pegged at roughly \$16 billion a year, and the cost of ending it at but \$4 billion a year—a four-to-one cost/benefit ratio. Even more to the point, the new technologies required to fight pollution create new industries—which create new jobs and expand economic activity. Most of the higher costs on products will be at the expense of the consumer's wallet, not the company's profits. At least that has been the case with federal auto safety laws.

This is not to deny that in the short run the government's environmental actions will result in job displacements and press some companies hard. And this should not be taken lightly. But the fact remains that most plant closures will occur in industries that are on the rocks anyway. Those that have to pollute to survive should switch to some other line of activity. The need here is to come up with a package of tax breaks or other aids for industries not too marginal to be saved. There should be no cave-in on the issue of whether the country is economically better off clean than dirty. It unarguably is.

Part of the problem with the White House's credibility on the environment lies in certain activities of Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans. He is of course fulfilling his Cabinet division's role to serve as advocate of industry's interests, as he should. And on the surface one can buy the position he outlined in his recent speech before the National Petroleum Council: "If we fix the right priorities—if we integrate our environmental, technological and economic interests—all of them can be served, without one dominating the other." But this "fairness" passage rests in a speech whose basic inclination is apologetic for industry; it cautions the nation, literally, to "wait a minute" in its environmental thrust.

Frankly, given the laws on the books or in preparation, or the past or planned actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, America's environmental program is already prudent enough. The admittedly tough-air-quality standards set by the EPA, for example, are not beyond the capability of industry groups to meet. And among communities even New York City, with probably the biggest air-quality challenge, expects to meet upcoming deadlines using the available technologies. Some communities like Los Angeles say they will not be able to meet the deadlines, but this is thought to be more a reflection of their will than of their ability to succeed.

Mr. Stans' speech compares unfavorably with a similar talk given before another oil group a few weeks earlier by Sydney Howe of the Conservation Foundation. Mr. Howe also gave industry credit for what it was doing and spending on environmental precautions. Yet he showed how some industries were unwisely bucking the environmental trend while others were taking constructive advantage of their predicament. For instance, the American Petroleum Institute he addressed was running a \$4 million ad campaign, in part justifying its Alaskan oil ambitions, and saying "A country that runs on oil can't afford to run short." But at the same time, according to Mr. Howe, New York City's Consolidated Edison Company was announcing that thereafter it would "advertise only to promote the conservation of electricity by consumers."

The nature of the White House decision process also gnaws at outsiders' confidence in the administration's environmental intentions. There is a technical question of

how the Freedom of Information Act should apply to that process. Outside environmental groups and many congressmen would like made public all reports which spell out the positions of various agencies and staff factions. But much of this information has not been forthcoming. And there is confusion over how much, by law, should be. This frustrates those who want to monitor developments closely. It raises fears that political tradeoffs may be eating away at environmental program support in the White House.

Already the administration has lost environmentalist points by having backed the Alaska pipeline before any meaningful ecological impact study had been made. The question inside the administration was always *how* to build the pipeline, never whether. And its support for the SST was based on other than environmental grounds.

There are signs that Mr. Ruckelshaus is now meeting quite a contentious atmosphere in the White House. At this point, observers think he is holding his own against "economic" pressures. His political future, of course, may ride with his success in holding his ground while not publicly scoring against his adversaries.

To take an overall reading at this date, it is only fair to say the Nixon administration has more pluses on its environmental record than minuses. It has a strong legislative program in Congress—perhaps not as strong as some might wish, but strong enough for this stage in the game. It should be given credit for coming around on such issues as fuller funding for municipal sewage systems. The Council on Environmental Quality, the environmental policy resource board for the administration, is ably staffed, another reflection of the White House's intentions.

And, as with the SST and Alaska pipeline, it might be too much to expect under any administration, especially one traditionally with a business constituency, for all the victories to go to the environmentalists, even all the vital ones.

But again, one trusts that President Nixon appreciates the political capital at hand in his EPA chief and the record to date. One trusts he will not risk his administration's environmental credibility by seeming to back both roar-ahead Ruckelshaus and wait-a-minute Stans.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an innovative way to restructure our health system is presently being attempted in Minneapolis. At the hearings I conducted recently, Mr. Charles Bellows testified on the Bakken concept.

The Minneapolis Medical Center was formed by the partial consolidation of five health centers; Mount Sinai, Lutheran Deaconess, and Abbott-Northwestern Hospitals, the Kenny Rehabilitation Institute, and the Children's Health Center, the latter being now under construction. Representatives of these health centers are discussing possible implementation of the Bakken concept. The plan is to provide a profitmaking corps common to all hospitals. Progress with this idea will be interesting to watch, especially with the growing concern over

health reform. The following statement describes the Bakken concept in more detail:

MINNEAPOLIS MEDICAL CENTER, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 26, 1971.
Re: Delivery of Health Care Services.
Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
Federal Court Building,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR DON: The Minneapolis Medical Center (MMCI) consists of Mount Sinai, Lutheran Deaconess, and Abbott-Northwestern Hospitals, the Kenny Rehabilitation Institute and the Children's Health Center now under construction. These health care organizations (MMCH), often referred to as "the Chicago Avenue Complex" was formed three years ago in an effort to combat skyrocketing health care costs through consolidation, sharing of services, both clinical and supporting, and increased efficiency in the delivery of all phases of health care. It has been, at least, a start.

Earl Bakken, currently chairman of the MMCI Board, has developed what is customarily referred to as the "Bakken Concept." The most recent summation of this

Concept (February 1971) entitled "An Innovative Method of Structuring and Financing a Medical Center" is submitted to you and to your staff as perhaps one answer, or a part of the overall answer, to many problems which the health care industry must face and answer. All MMCH participants have not yet taken a final position on the Bakken Concept. However, MMCI directors are of the opinion that this innovative approach should be carefully considered by you and your staff as Congress zeros in on the federal government's role in reforming and financing the delivery of health care services. In essence, the proposal is to create a profit-making core which will include virtually all services common to the existing hospitals, thus creating mass with efficiency but at the same time preserving the identities of the separate voluntary organizations in terms of STAFF and patient care, and providing an innovative method of attracting capital. (See pp. 7-8 of booklet for Concept as such.)

Whether in terms of the Bakken Concept, in whole, in part or in spirit, MMCH participants are of the opinion that increased dollar input alone won't necessarily produce a better health care system. Every separate segment of the entire health care system in

metropolitan Hennepin County, public and private, must be integrated into a restructured health care system. To do better than which has been done in the past will not of itself provide the answer despite more dollars—industry and/or government provided. "Rewards" must be granted to that system which keeps our people healthy and out of hospitals. Third-party reimbursement, whether federal or privately oriented, should focus on such "rewards." But the federal government alone isn't the answer.

The challenge of the '70s to restructure our health care system can be met only if "health providers" such as MMCH and their top-flight professionals, make their voices heard in Washington, their actions coordinated at home through a central but local agency such as the newly-created Metropolitan Health Board, and their skills, experience and local power directed toward the new health care system of the '70s.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. BELLOWES,
Vice Chairman, Minneapolis Medical
Center, Inc.

A. KENNETH PETERSON,
Executive Vice President, Mount Sinai
Hospital.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 29, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In Thee, O Lord, do I put my trust: Let me never be put to confusion.—Psalms 71: 1.

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, our Rock of Refuge in every time of need, we come before Thee with the realization that we have not handled wisely the life Thou hast given us. We have done those things we ought not to have done and we have left undone those things we ought to have done. We would laugh and love, yet we often complain and condemn. We would be honorable and honest, yet we wear masks of acceptance and approval. We would reach out to others in faith and fellowship, yet we shrink behind walls of caution and compromise.

Forgive our foolish ways, reclothe us in our rightful minds, renew our spirits that we may begin to live more confidently and more creatively for the welfare of our country and the well-being of all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4713. An act to amend section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to correct an omission in existing law with respect to the entitlement of committees of

the House of Representatives to the use of certain currencies.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8866) entitled "An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1152. An act to facilitate the preservation of historic monuments, and for other purposes.

RED COMMUNIST CHINA AND THE U.N.

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York will soon consider the question of seating Red Communist China and the future of the Republic of China as a member of that organization. The question of the admittance of Red Communist China seems moot at this point since the administration has already expressed its willingness to go along with such a move.

I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am at a loss to fathom the convolutions in the White House that have brought us to this point of embracing an avowed enemy and turning our backs on a friend of long standing who deserves better. I cannot understand how we can afford to abandon our friends on Taiwan, friends who, as charter members of the U.N., have joined us for so many years in fighting Communist domination of Asia.

If we abandon the Nationalist Chinese now, what kind of image do we present to Asia and the rest of the world? Are we to be believed in anything we do or promise? Certainly our track record of late provides little reason for others to trust us.

In essence, are we not sacrificing our image, our morals, and our ideals to accept an enemy as a fellow into an organization which accomplishes little or nothing, talks much and extravagantly and wastefully spends more? Since the American public pays the tab for almost half of the cost of that East River debating society it seems to me they should have some say on how their Government conducts itself within that body. Who knows, perhaps a majority of our people are fed up with paying for an anti-American sounding board. Perhaps they want out or perhaps they would like a complete reassessment of our monetary and moral support of the United Nations. Would that be so bad, the American international stuffed shirts to the contrary notwithstanding?

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 10835, UNTIL MIDNIGHT THURSDAY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Government Operations may have until Thursday midnight to file a report on H.R. 10835, a bill to establish a Consumer Protection Agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CROSS-FLORIDA CANAL AND ECOLOGICAL PLUS

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1